

GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

REVIEWING PROCESS

Architecture Civil Engineering Environment (ACEE) is committed to a fair, timely and professional peer-review process. Peer review supports editorial decision-making and helps authors improve the quality, clarity and scientific value of their manuscripts. Reviewers are expected to follow the ACEE Editorial Policy and the principles of publication ethics throughout the review process.

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

Reviewers should provide an objective, impartial and constructive assessment of the scientific merit of the manuscript. Comments should be clear, evidence-based and respectful. Personal criticism of authors is unacceptable. Reviewers should distinguish between issues that are essential for the validity or interpretation of the work and suggestions that are optional improvements.

A reviewer who does not have the expertise required to assess the manuscript, or who cannot complete the review within the requested time, should promptly decline the invitation or inform the Sectional Editor.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND USE OF AI TOOLS

Manuscripts received for review are confidential documents. Reviewers must not share, distribute or discuss the manuscript, its data or unpublished findings with third parties without prior authorization from the editor. Information or ideas obtained through peer review must not be used for personal advantage or in the reviewer's own work before publication.

Reviewers must not upload the manuscript, its figures, data, supplementary materials or substantial excerpts to publicly available generative AI or AI-assisted tools where confidentiality, data protection or intellectual-property rights cannot be assured. Reviewers remain fully responsible for the content, accuracy and integrity of their review. Any use of AI tools that materially assists in preparing a review should be disclosed to the editor.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Reviewers should disclose any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest that could affect, or reasonably be perceived to affect, their impartiality. This includes relevant personal, professional, collaborative, competitive or financial relationships with the authors, their institutions or organizations connected with the work. When in doubt, the reviewer should inform the Sectional Editor, who will decide whether the review assignment should proceed.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS

When preparing a report, reviewers are asked to consider, where relevant:

- originality, relevance and significance of the work;
- appropriateness and transparency of the research design and methods;
- quality and adequacy of the data and analyses;
- reliability of the results and whether the conclusions are supported by the evidence;
- clarity, organization and completeness of the manuscript;
- appropriate use of figures, tables, terminology and units;
- adequacy, relevance and balance of the cited literature;
- whether limitations are appropriately acknowledged;
- clarity and quality of the English language insofar as it affects scientific communication.

Reviewers should not require authors to cite the reviewer's own work unless such citations are genuinely relevant to the manuscript.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION INTEGRITY

Reviewers should alert the Sectional Editor confidentially if they suspect plagiarism, duplicate or redundant publication, inappropriate image or data manipulation, fabricated or falsified results, undisclosed conflicts of interest, unethical research practices, or any other potential breach of research or publication integrity. Reviewers should provide sufficient information to allow the editor to assess the concern, but should not independently contact the authors or investigate alleged misconduct.

CHOICE OF REVIEWERS

The Sectional Editor seeks advice from experts in the relevant field. Manuscripts are normally evaluated by at least two independent reviewers. ACEE uses a single-anonymized peer-review process: reviewers know the authors' identities, whereas authors do not know the reviewers' identities. Authors may be asked to suggest suitable reviewers; however, the final selection of reviewers is made exclusively by the editor.

SUBMISSION OF REVIEW

Reviews are submitted in writing through the Editorial Manager system. The report should provide sufficiently detailed comments to support the reviewer's recommendation and to help the authors improve the manuscript. Reviewers should provide a clear recommendation in accordance with the options available in Editorial Manager. The final editorial decision rests with the editor and may differ from the reviewer's recommendation.

Reviewers are normally asked to submit their review within 21 days of accepting the invitation. If this is not possible, they should inform the editor as soon as possible so that an extension can be considered or an alternative reviewer can be invited.

REVISED MANUSCRIPT REVIEW

Reviewers may be invited to assess a revised manuscript when further expert evaluation is needed before a final decision can be made. When reviewing a revision, reviewers should consider the authors' response to the previous comments and assess whether the relevant concerns have been adequately addressed. The expected time for review of a revised manuscript is normally 14 days.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACEE gratefully acknowledges the contribution of reviewers who devote their expertise, time and attention to assessing manuscripts submitted to the journal. A Certificate of Review is issued for each completed review. The list of reviewers is published annually on the Journal's webpage.