**APPENDIX 4: EDITOR’S WORK PROGRAM** (update on January 5th, 2024)

Please, follow the Associated and Section editors' responsibilities defined in the Editorial Policy of Eclética Química in the **top tab: About the Journal.**

Once the submission is completed by the lead author, the journal’s Technical Support team submits the manuscript to the similarity analysis on Turnitin software and forwards the report to the Editor-in-Chief, who, after making comments/requests to the authors, chooses the Editor and communicates the journal staff for arrangements.

**EDITOR’S ACTIVITY** (***when any of the requirements below are not met—add a comment in the main text—which will then be sent to the authors by the journal staff. Please, use "the discussion space" below the submission to add any observation about the article and do not decide to create a new round, or reject and accept an article, because it is the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief. ANY CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS or REVIEWERS THROUGH THE SYSTEM SHOULD ONLY BE DONE BY THE STAFF, EXCEPT A REMINDER TO REVIEWERS.***)

***1) Components of articles*: Cover letter**: check that the *cover letter* contains the following author information: full name, affiliation, e-mail, ORCID IDs, and authors’ contribution as per *template.* Check also if weresuggested name, e-mail, the institution of 5 potential reviewers, acknowledgements, conflict interest declaration, if the use of AI was declared and other declarations according to the requirements expressed in the authors' guidelines at corresponding author(s) responsibility and in the Editorial Policy. It is better if the authors use the cover letter template.

***2) Main Text***

***Original articles***: title, abstract, keywords, introduction, materials and methods (experimental), results and discussion, conclusion or conclusions, and references.

***Minireview or review articles***: the experimental part and other topics can be suppressed, but must contain a title, abstract, keywords, content (with the topics and subtopics), discussion of the topics (figures, tables, equations, etc.) and the conclusion with conclusions remarks or final considerations, followed by references.

***Technical Note***: equipment construction, process description, specific experiment, case study, all related to chemistry or related fields. All must have experiments that validate the equipment, procedure, etc.

***Education in Chemistry and related areas***: like original articles, but with a clear definition of the target audience, with respective adequacy of the manuscript content, methodology, analysis of results, conclusion and references. Attention to ethical issues (***See the Eclética Química Editorial Policy and the recommendations therein***.)

***3) Read the article* and check that it conforms to the journal rules and inform the STAFF of the necessity to go back to the authors for the first correction before the peer reviewing process**: this phase should be accomplished as soon as possible (7 days maximum).

**a)- Abstract**: maximum 170 words; an abbreviation should be used in the abstract only if it appears more than once; its meaning must given by the first time it appears.

**b)- Keywords**: 3-5 keywords; preferably not words from the title.

**c)- Graphical Abstract**: Is there a clear and concise *graphical abstract* representing the article?

**d) Highlights are mandatory**: 3 to 5 bullet points with **85 characters** maximum, including spaces)

**e)- Figures**: Are the figures appropriate? Are the axes of the figures correct with units in parentheses? Are decimals separated from units by a dot?

**f)- Captions**: are the figure captions placed after the figures and are they adequate?

**g)- Tables**: Do the tables have the correct (SI) units and are these units correctly placed in the text? Are decimals separated from units by a dot? Is the number of decimals with physical meaning and statistically, correct?

**h)- Units in tables**: Are the units in tables, text, and figures consistent with each other (standardized)?

**i)- Headings and subheadings**: Are headings, subheadings and subsubheadings numbered in the text sequentially without including zero before the number? Are the headings in bold, the subheadings in italics and bold, and the subsubheadings in italics without bold? Do the units follow the International System (SI)?

**j)- Abbreviations**: Do abbreviations have their meaning clearly expressed when they first appear in the text? Once given its meaning, is this abbreviation used throughout the text? Preferably, no abbreviations should be used in headings and subheadings. Preferably, a sentence should not start with an abbreviation in an article.

**l)- References**: ***In the text***, check that they are cited as indicated in the *Author guidelines*.

***In the list of references***, check that the references have been correctly cited and with their DOI numbers. Avoid using theses and dissertations as references. ***Website references*** must indicate the date of access.

***Check that all references*** cited in the text are in the list and vice versa.

 ***Check if*** there are recent references.

**m)- English**: in a quick reading, is the English satisfactory? Does English need to be revised?

***4) Please inform* the journal staff (e-mail: ecletica@ctrlk.com.br) immediately if the text should be going back to the authors to respond to the Editor-in-Chief’s comments on similarity and the Associated and Section Editors’ comments on the article’s compliance with the journal’s standards.**

***5) If the article* must go back to the authors, when it is returned, revise it to see if all requirements have been met.**

***6) Inform the staff* about returning the article and add to the email the list of 5 reviewers to be invited as reviewers (review deadline 3 weeks for the 1st round and 2 weeks for the others).** Suggestion: if the article goes back to the author, consult with potential reviewers, and prepare other reviewers list.

***7) Search for reviewers*:** Suggestion: t**his activity can be done during the period when authors are fulfilling editor requirements.**

***a) Check if one or more reviewers*** informed by the authors can be invited; they cannot be from the same workplace (department, Faculty, Institutes) as the authors and preferably not have published with the authors in the last 5 years.

***b) Search for reviewers*** - complete the 5 reviewers to be invited and forward them (full name, email and, if possible, institution and phone number) to the STAFF to make the invitation via the system. Suggestion: search CNPq Portal by subject; Google by subject; article references; universities, etc.

***c) Invitation to reviewers***: Associated and Section editors send the list to the STAFF that makes the invitation. The reviewers will receive the article by the system (default email that will be provided) sent by the STAFF. Editors should make invitations to the same reviewers from their emails and inform the STAFF when they accept to review the manuscript. Once the invitation has been accepted by the system, the STAFF should inform the authors that reviewers have accepted the invitation to review the manuscript.

***d) In possession of the set of 5 reviewers,*** the STAFF forwards the abstract with a deadline of **3** days for the reviewers to accept or not review the manuscript.

The time for reviewers to complete their reports is **21** days for the ***1st round*** and 15 days ***for the others***. If the reviewer requests an extension of time (1 week is usually granted), the **Editor-in-Chief** makes the decision.

***e) Number of reviewers to evaluate the manuscript***: preferably 3, acceptable 2, exceptionally 4 or more.

***f) The Associated/Section Editor takes charge*** of keeping track of reviewing deadlines and sending "reminders" to reviewers: Suggestion: send, by the system, on the 10th day of the review deadline a "reminder" to the reviewer and another one as soon as the deadline is over (ask the STAFF how to do this). When the deadline is over, the editor should also charge by email.

***8) Review*:**

***a) Reviews completed the 1st round***: The Editor requests forwarding to the authors or suggests a rejection with the possibility of resubmitting the article as a new submission. This is intended to provide the possibility of resubmission and not to harm the journal with increased review time. In case the Editor wants to discuss with the Editor-in-Chief before deciding about suggesting the rejection of the manuscript, please, feel free to do this. Finally, the STAFF should send the email in the name of the Editor-in-Chief, who is responsible for rejecting the article.

***b) Other rounds***: the steps of analysis of the manuscripts are accompanied by the Editor responsible for the manuscript. The Editor should inform the STAFF when comments and corrections should be sent by the system to the reviewers or the authors.

***c) Acceptance***: The Editor, based on the reviewers’ opinions, or when it is a simple correction or adjustment, will decide whether to suggest acceptance of the manuscript, with or without returning it to the reviewers. In any case, the correction suggested by the reviewer should be made or justified by the authors before acceptance or at the time of the "proofreading" review. All the exchange information among the authors, associated editor/section editors and editor-in-chief is made via the OJS system by the STAFF.

***9) The staff provides the Editing of the manuscript in the order of acceptance,*** verifies the similarity using the ITHENTICATE software and forwards it to the Associated Editor and the Editor-in-Chief, who must read the text and suggest any changes to the authors. Then the proofreading is prepared and sent to the authors.

***10) The "proofreading" should return from the authors in 3 days, and the STAFF publishes the article. Eclética Química adopts continue publication.***