

### **IFTA Journal Peer Review Process**

To select a *Journal* Committee, the editor selects a group of ca. five internationally recognized reviewers who have demonstrated relevant experience and do not hold a conflict of interest. A Call for papers goes out from December to end of May via the monthly IFTA Update. The peer review process of papers received generally ends about end of July.

The editor sends copies of an author's manuscript to the reviewers by e-mail. Usually, there are two or three individual reviewers for each submitted paper-.

Each reviewer then returns an evaluation to the editor, noting weaknesses or any possible problems along with suggestions for improvement. The review should be done in a timely manner i.e. about 3 weeks after receiving the articles.

The task of the *Journal* Committee is to read, select and assess the suitability of the submitted research papers for publication on technical analysis articles written from authors all around the globe.

The research papers are required to:

- a) be original,
- b) deal with at least two different international markets,
- c) develop a reasoned and logical argument and lead to a sound conclusion supported by the tests, studies and analysis contained in the paper,
- d) be of practical application,
- e) add to the body of knowledge in the discipline of international technical analysis.

Reviewers' evaluations should include an explicit recommendation concerning the manuscript, chosen from the below mentioned options:

- to unconditionally accept the manuscript or proposal,
- to accept it upon corrections or improvements as identified by reviewers,
- to reject it, but encourage revision and invite resubmission,
- to reject it out right.

The editor then evaluates the reviewers' comments, her or his own opinion of the manuscript, with consideration of the scope and purpose of the journal and readership, before sending a written decision to the author(s) with the referees' comments. During this process, the role of the reviewer is advisory, and the editor is typically under no formal obligation to accept the opinions of the individual reviewers. Furthermore, the reviewers do not act as a group, do not necessarily communicate with each other, and typically are not aware of each other's evaluations. There is usually no requirement that the individual reviewers achieve consensus.