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1. Introduction
This document is intended to provide answers to questions that we have received over the years at EM Support about Editorial Manager. We hope that you will find this useful. The various entries in the Table of Contents are clickable and lead you straight to the relevant section. If you come across any references to ‘above’ or ‘below’ that are highlighted in green, these are also clickable and will lead you straight to the associated information. You can search this document by simultaneously pressing the ‘CTRL’ and ‘F’ keys on your keyboard – that should pull up a free-text field allowing you to search on keywords. In many cases, if specific features are mentioned without further details, you can usually find more detailed information on that option (including screenshots) in the Editor's Manual. If you have any questions about the system whatsoever, or need help resolving an issue, please do not hesitate to reach out to EM Support.

1.1 Where can I find more information about how EM works?
On the Editorial Manager (EM) login page for your journal, you can find extensive manuals for editors, but also for authors and reviewers right next to the login box. In addition, we have a dedicated EM Support website where you can find tutorial videos, as well as FAQs for editors, but also for reviewers and authors. You may also find the General Introduction useful. If you have any questions at all about the system, please feel free to get in touch with EM Support at Brill at any time.

2. User trouble
2.1 User cannot access EM
In general, whenever a letter is sent via EM, it will include the user's username and a link to create/reset their password. If a user is trying to access the system and is unable to do so be aware of the following:

1. **Direct link in the email has meanwhile expired:** For security reasons, links that will immediately log a user into the system and take them to the appropriate page in EM (such as the link to set up the password) will automatically expire after 3 clicks or 5 days (whichever comes first), so if a user complains that a link no longer works, that is usually why. Once a user has set up their password, however, they should be able to log into the system at any time via the EM page itself and access any paper they need to by looking it up manually.

2. **Forgotten password:** If need be, a user can have their access codes resent by pressing the send login details link in the login box on the EM site (on the next page, they will then need to enter their email address and press the button to send their login details). If this does not work, however, it may well be that the user has multiple accounts in the system (you can check this via Search People), in which case you as editor can merge the duplicate accounts and send the user the surviving access codes as part of the merging process (see the Editor’s Manual, section 2.2.3 for more details on how to do this). As editor, you can also send a user their access codes via Search People (look up the person and click on their name in the search results – on the next page, press the ‘Send Login Details’ button on the left). On the account information page, you can also check whether the user’s email is correctly registered and if needed, correct it (any changes can be saved by clicking on ‘submit’ at the bottom of the page).

3. **User is locked out:** if someone tries to log in 5 times and fails within a 30-minute timeframe, the system will temporarily lock the account. The lockout should be lifted automatically after 10 minutes, so if the user tries again after 10 minutes, they should be able to get back into the system without further problems. Basically, by the time you receive the email and are ready to respond, it is very likely that the issue has already been resolved so you can simply ask them to try again and let you know if the problems persist.

We suggest to also consider proxying for the user to speed things up as in most cases, the user is trying to simply take a quick action in the system, and by using the proxy mode you can also take care of this on their behalf (e.g., enter a reviewer’s agreement into the system for them). More information on how to use the proxy mode can be found in the Editor’s Manual, section 2.2.2.

If need be, EM Support can also assist here so please feel free to refer the user to EM@brill.com.
2.2 An author/reviewer has asked for their account to be removed - how do I do that?
You can forward any requests for account removal to EM Support so that we can make sure that this is done following a standardized format. Since the European Privacy Law GDPR went into effect, we are legally obliged to remove user records if requested by the user. You can find more information on the GDPR and how Brill is handling that within the context of EM in this Editors Newsletter.

Removal of a user record does exactly that: it removes the record so that you will no longer be able to find them via Search People. If the user has been active as author, reviewer or editor, their name will be retained in the associated manuscript records – that is needed because the editor needs to be able to access the full info on a ms, a.o. to be able to detect potential fraud and determine for instance, who at the time reviewed a ms.

2.3 Reviewer cannot find submission in main menu
If a reviewer claims they cannot find the submission they were asked to review in their main menu, please check whether they may have multiple accounts in the system. You can do so by looking up the reviewer via Search People. If they have multiple accounts, you can merge these (see the Editor's Manual, section 2.2.3 for details) and this should resolve the problem.

Otherwise, they may have inadvertently logged into the author menu instead of the reviewer menu. When logging in, the reviewer needs to press the ‘Reviewer Login' button.

Be aware that reviewers do not get access to the entire manuscript until after they have actually agreed to review in the system.

Note that if you invited a book reviewer to submit a Book Review for publication, that book reviewers are considered authors in Editorial Manager and will therefore need to log in as an author rather than as a reviewer. This is due to the fact that a Book Reviewer is submitting a paper that is intended to be published in the journal, while reviewers (or referees) are asked to advise the editors as to whether a paper is suitable for publication and if so, how it could be improved further – this advice is not intended for final publication.

2.4 Author/reviewer does not want to use the Editorial Manager system
In some cases, you may encounter authors or reviewers who are reluctant to use the system. The system provides so-called ‘proxy' functionality that allows you to take action on someone else’s behalf without needing their access codes. By using his proxy option, you can choose to for instance submit a ms on the author's behalf, or a review on a reviewer's behalf. This way, you can still get all the information into the system. More information on how to proxy can be found in the Editor's Manual, section 2.2.2.

3. Correspondence
3.1 What kind of letters are sent to authors and reviewers?
The system will send a number of letters to authors and reviewers, which you can find in the overview below. Some of these are fully automated as they are triggered by an action taken by the author or reviewer. These automated letters are identified in the overview with an asterisk (*). Other letters that are triggered by you as an editor can usually be edited before sending. If you want to be able to view and potentially edit a letter, use the ‘Custom' option. Usually you get to choose between sending the default letters and customizing them. If you come across system letters where you would like to have the template letter updated so that you can avoid having to make the same changes every time you send it, please contact EM Support.

Author letters:
- Acknowledgement of receipt for new/revised ms*
- Notification of ms number*
- Invitations to write an article (and cancellations)
- Decision letter / request for changes
- Revision reminders
- Ad hoc emails sent via Send Email
Reviewer letters:
- Acknowledgement of receipt for agreement/declining/submission of review*
- Review invitations and cancellations
- Review reminders
- Notification of editorial decision (rare, only if activated for the journal)
- Ad hoc emails sent via Send Email

3.2 How do I see what letters are sent by the system?
Whenever you take action as an editor, you can use the custom/customize option to view and if desired, edit the letters. If you want to see which kind of letters have been sent for a ms, please click on the History action link of the ms – the bottom half of the history page shows you all the letters that have been sent to date for that particular ms and you can view a letter's contents by clicking on the letter name.

If you want to make structural changes to specific letter templates, please contact EM Support.

3.3 Can we store correspondence sent outside EM within EM?
Yes, this is possible. By default, the correspondence archive that you can access via History only logs those emails that were sent straight from EM. Such emails are then sent to the recipients mailbox just like any other email. The system will automatically have inserted the email address of the person who triggered the email (or in some cases the journal email address) so that when someone clicks 'reply' in their mailbox, their reply will simply be sent to the mailbox of the person listed as the sender of the original email – the reply is not sent back to EM and hence does not automatically end up in the correspondence archive in EM.

If you want to be able to keep track of emails sent/received outside the system via EM, by default, you have two options:

- Either use the ms notes on details and simply make a note in there for instance stating that the author was granted 3 weeks' extension for their revision, or you could add a short note referring to important correspondence in your mailbox. The manuscript notes text box can be found via the details action link of the ms (about halfway down the page). This is basically your internal editorial notepad and you can insert any comments that you may wish to keep track of – these comments cannot be seen by authors or reviewers. If you insert a comment, we would advise to always add your initials and date at the end between brackets (so that you can easily see who made the comment, when and use that to determine whether it is still relevant) AND to make sure that the 'Display Manuscript Notes Flag' checkbox immediately above is ticked before you save your changes. The latter will trigger a little red triangle next to the details action link which should serve as a visual reminder that you have editorial comments stored for that ms.

- OR you can add any important correspondence to the email archive manually by opening history and clicking on the ‘Add editorial correspondence’ button at the top of the ‘Correspondence History’ section (bottom half of the page). You can then copy-paste the correspondence there and if you put in the right date and time after submitting it will automatically show up in the correspondence overview in the right location.

It is also possible to activate a drop box system which will allow you to forward any relevant emails that were sent/received outside EM to a specific email address, after which the system will automatically load the email to the correspondence archive for the ms in EM. If you wish to make use of this option, please contact EM Support for activation.

3.4 How to make changes to system letters
As editor, you can change system letters that are connected to specific editor actions (e.g., reviewer invitations, decision letters) yourself on a case-by-case basis (look out for the ‘Custom’/‘Customize’ links/buttons – these will allow you to view and if desired, edit the letter before sending). If you want to see which letters have been sent for a ms to date, please click on the History action link of the ms – the bottom half of the history page shows you all the letters that have been sent to date for that ms and you can view a letter's contents by clicking on the letter name.
If you find yourself making the same changes over and over again, please contact EM Support as then it is probably better if we change the default system letters for you in the back end.

3.5 The main contact address for the journal has changed, how to update EM?
If the email address that is used as the Contact Us address and/or journal sender address in EM has changed, please contact EM Support so that we can make sure this is changed in the system back end as well.

4. Submissions

4.1 How does the submission process work for authors?
Authors should go to the Editorial Manager site and log in using the AUTHOR login button. If they do not have an account yet, they will need to create one first using the Register Now link. Once logged in, they can start a submission using the Submit New Manuscript link. They will be guided stepwise through the submission process (the proceed/next buttons allow them to navigate from one page to the next and the circles at the top of the page do not only signal when a section has been completed, or is missing information, but can also be used as navigation buttons):

1. First they need to select an article type from the drop down menu (e.g., Full Length Article)
2. The next step is to supply the files (‘Attach Files’). If your journal uses a double blind review system, the author will need to prepare at least two editable files, preferably in MS Word:
   a) ‘Title Page’ file: this should include the full title of the ms, all author's names and addresses, abstract, keywords and any acknowledgements.
   b) ‘Manuscript (anonymized)’ file: this should include the full title of the ms, the text as well as any tables, but no clues regarding the author's identity.

The ‘Title Page’ is the file that they should upload first; once uploaded, the page will refresh and show what other files should be uploaded. The only files that are generally required at this point are the title page and the anonymized ms file (and for revisions, a response to reviews as well). If any other files are needed for submission and still missing, these will be shown in red.

From the drop down menu, the author can select the appropriate item type label and upload the additional file(s) as needed. Please note that if the author fails to upload any of the required file types, the system will not let the author proceed with submission.

3. [General Information & review preferences: Depending on whether certain information is requested for your journal, the author may be asked for instance to choose a section, select classifications, supply suggestions for reviewers or request an editor. For most journals, these steps are suppressed.]

4. Additional information: the author will be asked to answer a number of queries.

5. Comments: the author will be able to supply some comments for the editor by way of a short cover letter if they want to – this is not required, so the author can choose to skip this step. [If the author has filled out anything here, you can find their comments on the editorial side by clicking on the details action link of the ms and checking the ‘Author Comments’ section at the top of the page.]

6. Manuscript data:
   a) Full Title* (required)
   b) Short Title (optional)
   c) Abstract* (required, max. 150 words)
d) Keywords* (required, max. 8)
e) Authors and affiliations* (min info to be supplied for each author: title, first name, last name, email address).
f) Funding Information (optional)

7. When the author has filled out all information, they can set the system to build a PDF of their submission using ‘Build PDF for Approval’. The system will then take the source files supplied and combine them into a single PDF that is used for the editorial process.**

8. At that point, the author can choose whether or not they wish to have their article published in Open Access (if eventually accepted for publication).

9. Once the PDF has been built, the author is asked to View Submission, indicate their agreement with the Ethical Conditions (a.o. that a ms should only be submitted to one journal at a time, that all authors agree, etc.) and Approve Submission. The latter sends the ms over to the editorial side.

* What the system will do with the files provided at the start of the process is that it will use the ‘Title Page’ file to automatically pull out the ms title, abstract, keywords and authors' names and affiliations into the fields listed above with an asterisk (*) so that the author will not need to fill these out manually (provided that the source files are supplied in Ms Word or Open Office format – in the future we expect that the file types for which this auto-extraction applies will be expanded and that funding information will also be pulled out automatically from the title page file). If the auto-extraction does not work, the author can still enter the information manually.

** The system will actually create two PDFs: one for the author/editor that contains all the files that were supplied by the author and one for the reviewers, that will only contain the ‘Manuscript (anonymized)” file plus figures and tables. The editor can see both versions of the submission PDF via the View Submission action link, the author only gets to see the author/editor version. As long as the ‘item’ labels connected to the files are correct, the system will automatically know which files to exclude from the reviewer PDF. Note, though, that the system cannot check whether the actual contents of the files match with what you would expect based on the name of the associated item label, so if the ‘Manuscript (anonymized)” file were to include the author's name, that is what the reviewer will get to see as well.

The information we ask the author to provide is needed either for you as editor, for the system to function properly, or for Brill to facilitate the post-acceptance process and thereby avoid unnecessary delays in the publication process. For instance: the separate abstract text is included in the email invitations to reviewers; the separate title page is automatically excluded from the Reviewer PDF so that the site supports a double blind review process but still includes an editable source file with the required author data and such that will be needed for typesetting when the paper is eventually accepted.

The Author's Manual includes detailed information as to how to submit an article and a link to this manual is available in various places in EM (a.o. the EM login page, the author's main menu page and the first page of the submission process).

4.2 Author sent ms via email, how to get this in EM

In such cases you have various options:

1. Ask the author to submit it online themselves.
2. If the author does not have an account yet (check via Search People), you can create one for them using the register new user link (available on the search people page as well as at the bottom of your main menu) and use the accompanying registration email to ask the author to resubmit the paper online using the access codes in the registration email.
3. Proxy for the author and submit the manuscript for them. First see if they are already registered in EM, and if need register the author (see point 2 above). To proxy for the author, go to Search People, look up the author by last name, and then in the search results, click on the Author role. This should be highlighted in yellow to the right of the author's name. This will lead you into proxy mode and will allow you to submit the paper for the author. At the end of the submission process, the system will create a PDF of the submission, which will need to be checked and approved. If not approved, the submission will remain on the author's side. Approval is the step after which a manuscript is sent through to you. Should you come across information that is requested that you do not have at hand yet and do not necessarily need at this stage, be aware that the system can generally only check if the required field has text in it, not whether it actually contains the requested information, so as a workaround you could simply add N/A, or a full stop – any bit of text will do – as long as something has been entered, the system will let you proceed.
4.3 How to handle Special Issues via EM

If you wish to process special issues via EM as well, that is no problem. We can create a dedicated special issue article type for you ('Special Issue: [short title of the Special Issue]' – label should be max. 75 characters, incl. spaces). Authors can then choose this Special Issue article type upon submission so that it is clearer for you as editors to see that a paper is intended for a special issue (in EM you would then see the name of the special issue listed in the Article Type column instead of for instance ‘Full Length Article’). To have these dedicated special issue article type labels added to the system and hidden when finalized, you can simply send a request to EM Support. By default, Special Issue article types will have the same settings as a Full Length Article in terms of nr of reviews required, deadlines, etc. You can also use the ‘Linked Submissions’ option to keep track of the special issue papers as part of a group (see also below as well as the Editors Manual, sections 3.1.12 and 3.15).

In addition, we can also grant Guest Editors access to EM. By default, Guest Editor roles are similar to those of a default Associate Editor: Guest Editors would only get access to mss assigned to them specifically; the Special Issue mss initially go to the main editor, just as the regular material and the main editor will assign the Special Issue mss on to the Guest Editor(s) as appropriate; by default, accept and reject decisions are returned to the main editor for approval though if you wish, you can also choose to have revise decisions returned for approval as well, or just the accepts. The min. required for approval is the accept decisions as that way, the main editor can ensure the accepted mss are up to standard, and are eventually sent over to Brill for typesetting. To have Guest Editors set up in the system (and removed again when done), please send a request to EM Support. If you have a Guest Editor role in use already, we only need to have the journal name plus name and contact details of the Guest Editor. If this is the first time that a special issue is processed for the journal, please also indicate which decision types need to be approved by the main editor.

4.3.1 Special issue has more than 1 Guest Editor: how to give all Guest Editors access to all mss?

If a Special Issue is to be handled by 2 or more Guest Editors in EM, we can give all Guest Editors the Guest Editor role, but please note that:

- For each mss, only one Guest Editor can be the handling editor
- The handling editor is the one who is expected to send the mss for review and eventually enter the editorial decision into EM – Handling Editors will get a notice that a paper has been assigned to them
- Any other Guest Editors that need to be involved can be given unblinded access to the mss PDF, File Inventory & View Reviews and Comments by initiating a discussion with them for a mss, or given blinded access to the mss by sending them a review invitation.

4.4 I want to email the author of a ms, where can I find their contact info?

There are several ways to find the author's contact information:

**Via the mss:**

1. If you see the author's name displayed as a hyperlink, click on the link and you will find the author's email address at the top and can either copy it from there or click on the email address – the latter will open a new email to that address in your own mailbox.
2. Click on details. The corresponding author as well as their email address is shown at the top of the Details page. Same as point 1 above: either copy the email address to a new email or simply click on it to open a new email in your inbox.
3. Click on Send Email and choose the ‘AUTHOR: Query from Editor’ template. You can edit this template letter as necessary and send it straight from EM. It will automatically be sent to the Corresponding Author of the ms. In addition, because you are sending this email via EM instead of via your own mailbox (as is the case in points 1&2 above), a copy of the email be automatically be saved to the correspondence archive of the ms that you can access via the History action link of the ms.
Via **Search People**:
Look up the person and click on their name in the search results. On the page that follows you can find (and if needed, update) their contact information. If you make any changes here, click on 'Submit' at the bottom of the page to save them.

### 4.5 Author claims to have uploaded ms/revision, not received by editor

This may have a variety of causes:

- The most common one is probably that the author has missed a step and the ms is **still in the author's menu** as **incomplete** or **waiting for approval**. In that case, the ms has not yet been formally submitted and hence, you have not yet received it on the editorial side. If a ms has been successfully submitted, the author should automatically receive a confirmation of receipt and should also see that the ms has moved to the Submissions (or Revisions) Being Processed folder in their main menu. To get the ms submitted, either ask the author to complete the process or help them get the ms submitted by using the proxy option. You are also welcome to refer the author to [EM Support](#) for further assistance. If helpful, we can create a quick search link in your editorial main menu allowing you to see any submissions that are stuck in author menus (to get this set up, please contact [EM Support](#)).

- The ms has in fact been submitted but the **editor** who is asking about the ms does **not** have access (e.g., ms is still pending with another editor for technical screening). For many journals, for instance Associate Editors only have access to mss for which they have actually been **assigned** as handling editor.

### 4.6 Submission conversion errors: how to fix?

In Brill publications, non-Roman scripts are frequently used. If an author uploads a Word file with for instance Hebrew included, it may happen that when the system converts that Word file into PDF to create the submission PDF that the Hebrew text is then scrambled, and that you then for instance see little square boxes in the submission PDF instead of the actual Hebrew text. If that happens, we advise the author to upload both the original Word file and in addition, a PDF source file in which all text is displayed correctly. That way, you will always have at least one manuscript version included in the submission PDF that is fully legible. The PDF source file is generally not required for submission and if it is included, it will show up in the submission PDF at the end.

We strongly advise to always use Unicode fonts and embed the fonts in the source file; this will already reduce the risk of conversion and eventual typesetting errors. For more information about Unicode fonts and handling non-Roman scripts, please visit the [Brill website](#).

### 4.7 An author has provided LaTeX files and there are problems with the submission PDF, how do I fix?

Unfortunately, we cannot provide full technical support for LaTeX, though you may find the following general pointers useful in case problems arise in EM that are connected to LaTeX source files.

First, we advise to check the submission PDF for any error messages (usually in the format of '! LaTeX Error:...') as these may already provide clues as to what may be the problem. In many cases, the problems are related to the files having been uploaded in the incorrect order (see also below), missing TeX files (e.g., missing .sty file), references/images referenced incorrectly in the main ms file or being referenced in subfolders. If you are unable to solve the issue, be aware that you can also ask the author to upload a PDF source file or rather a MS Word instead of a LaTeX file. For review purposes, the PDF source file will be fine and an editable LaTeX/Word version will not be strictly necessary until you need to do the final copyediting and send an accepted ms over to Brill for typesetting.

As for TeX files to be uploaded, we suggest to only upload one TeX submission file with the 'Manuscript (anonymized)' file type ('item') label. This file should be uploaded first; if you have more than one TeX file, these should be uploaded in the following order:

- testtex.tex (as 'manuscript (anonymized)')
- testclo.clo (as 'manuscript (anonymized)')
- testclass.cls (as 'manuscript (anonymized)')
- teststyle.sty (as 'manuscript (anonymized)')
- testbest.bst (as 'manuscript (anonymized)')
Note that:

- TeX files should NOT be uploaded as 'supplementary material.'
- If the author uploaded both a PDF and a TeX file for the submission, note that the file names for both should be different. Also note that '.pdf_t' is not a supported format so any such files should be renamed so as to end with '.PDF' in order to avoid errors in the submission PDF created by EM.
- There should only be one LaTeX style file (.sty) included in the submission. You can check here which LaTeX styles are supported by EM.
- When creating the TeX submission file, all non-standard plug-ins in the TeX software the author is using should be disabled.
- All the TeX files that are uploaded in EM should be referenced correctly in the main ms TeX file.
- All images should be referenced correctly and should not be referenced in sub-folders, otherwise they will not be included in the submission PDF that is created by EM.
- EM Support has a separate file available with more detailed information on LaTeX submissions and EM which we can share with you or the author upon request. The above is only a short summary of that file.

4.8 There are some technical issues (e.g., anonymization, layout, language, not content!) with the ms; how do I return to author for fixing?
You can return a ms to the author in any of the following ways:

- If the ms is still in New or Revised Submissions Requiring Assignment (or in Direct-to-Editor New or Revised Submissions): use the Send back to author action link and click on the customize link so that you can edit the letter to let the author know what they need to change. Note that when you use this option, the author can overwrite the current version, so this does not count as a formal revision and hence, when you get it back, the original version will be lost and cannot be used for comparison. More information on sending mss back to author can also be found in the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.7.
- Otherwise, make sure the ms has been assigned to yourself and submit a revise decision through Submit Editor's Decision and Comments, in which case the current version is retained for comparison and the author is expected to submit a formal revision. See also the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.9 on editor assignment and section 3.3.3 on submitting decisions.
- Alternatively, you can update the submission yourself using edit submission (see the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.6 for more details on how to do this).

4.9 Double blind review: how strict should anonymization be?
This is really an editorial decision: With double blind review, you can make this as strict as you want. The basic level is that the author's name and address as well as acknowledgements are not shared with the referees. This way you have made a reasonable effort to avoid the author's name being disclosed to the referees. Some editors go as far as not allowing self-referencing either. Even so, it may well be that even if thoroughly anonymized, the reviewers can still make an educated guess as to who might be the author because of the subject, the writing style, and even a lack of self-references can give a clue as it may be strange if one would expect work by that person to be listed among the references. Especially in subject areas where only a small group of researchers is active and everyone knows each other, people will often be able to guess who the author is anyway. The more you anonymize the contents of the paper, e.g. taking out self-references and such, the harder you are making it for yourself as you will need to remember to have all of these reinserted before final acceptance.
4.9.1 How to ensure whether ms is anonymized correctly so that the reviewer cannot see author name
When you click on the View Submission action link of a ms, you can choose whether to view the author/editor version or the reviewer version. The reviewer version of the PDF is the PDF that is made available to the reviewer, so if the author's name is included in there, that is what the reviewer will get to see as well.
Alternatively, you can check the File Inventory action link; here you will find (and can download) all of the files provided by the author for the current ms version. In principle, all files are included in the editor/author version of the PDF, but some files are excluded from the Reviewer PDF. The exclusion is based on the likelihood that a file may contain author details and is done fully automatically based on the 'Item' label associated with a file. Items that are excluded from the Reviewer PDF by default are 'Cover Letter,' 'Title Page,' 'Biographical Note' and 'Supplemental.' You can see which item type has been chosen for each files in the 'Item' column on the File Inventory page. The system cannot check whether the contents of the file actually match what you may expect based on the associated item label. So if the author used the wrong label or for instance included the author's name in the anonymized ms file, this will affect what the reviewer gets to see. That is why it is important that the editors check this when they receive the paper, to ensure that the Reviewer's version is complete and does not contain any clues to the author's identity. If anything is amiss in that respect, you can choose to either use Send Back to Author and ask the author to fix this, or use Edit Submission and fix the issue(s) yourself. More details on both of these actions can be found in the Editor's Manual, sections 3.1.7 and 3.1.6.

4.9.2 Ms is not properly anonymized – how do I fix?
See above.

4.10 Changes to Corresponding Authorship
To change the corresponding author of a ms, you can use Edit Submission and go to the ‘Add/Edit/Remove Authors’ step. If the new corresponding author is already listed, simply click on the pencil symbol for that person and in the pop up window tick the ‘this is the corresponding author’ box and save the changes by clicking on the ‘save’ icon (top left). If the person is not yet listed as an author for the ms, click ‘Add Another Author’ and fill out the new author's details on the next page, also ticking the ‘this is the corresponding author’ box and clicking on the ‘save’ icon.

As soon as you save the changes, you will get to see another pop up window; if the corresponding author is already available in the system, you can Confirm - > ‘OK.’
Otherwise, you can press the ‘Register New Corresponding Author’ button and you are led into the registration page, in which case, please fill out the required details and when done, press ‘continue’ and again, ‘continue’:

Once the new corresponding author has been added on the ‘Add/Edit/Remove Authors’ step, go to the ‘Attach Files’ step and keep confirming to set the system to create a new PDF file and confirm the author’s Open Access choice. Note that once the PDF has been rebuilt, you will also need to view and approve the new PDF of the submission. Also note that as Edit Submission basically allows you as the editor to update the various submission steps as taken by the author, the system provides some alerts during this process that addresses the you from an ‘author perspective’ (e.g., stating that when you change the corresponding author, you will no longer have access to the ms – this is relevant for the previous corresponding author only – as editor you will of course retain access to the ms, regardless of who the corresponding author is). If you need further assistance, please do not hesitate to reach out to EM Support.

4.11 Co-authors are asked to confirm their contribution; how does that work?

When a corresponding author submits a manuscript, any co-authors listed in the submission data will nowadays automatically get a request to confirm their co-authorship online and if desired, they can then connect their ORCID ID to the submission as well. Co-authors are not required to respond and there is no automated follow up either, so, if there is no response there are no ramifications for the editorial workflow. All the co-author needs to do is press the appropriate link in the email they received and then confirm their choice online. By default, this is the only correspondence a co-author receives from the system. All other correspondence continues to be handled by the Corresponding Author, though if you wish, it is possible for us to automatically copy in co-authors on decision letters. If you would like to make use of that, please contact EM Support.

We have chosen NOT to require the co-author to create an account in EM (or log in to an existing account) in order to confirm or deny their involvement in the ms (to keep this as simple as possible for the co-authors). As a result, co-authors cannot check the ms status or their own confirmation status online. On the editorial side, you can always see the co-author status via the Details action link of the ms (click on the Author Status link in the ‘Other Authors’ section): The ‘Confirmed?’ column will show whether co-authors have confirmed/denied their involvement.

4.11.1 How to resend co-author confirmation request?

If the co-author did not receive the request to confirm their co-authorship or the links in there have meanwhile expired, you can resend this as follows:

- Look up the manuscript and click on Details
- In the ‘Other Authors’ section, click on Author Status
On the Author Status page, look up the author for whom you need to resend the request for confirmation and click on **Resend Letter** and then on ‘Proceed.’ Note that if the ‘Confirmed?’ status is not shown as ‘No response’ but rather as ‘yes’ or ‘declined,’ the co-author had already successfully responded. If they put in the wrong answer, or would still like to add their ORCID ID, you can choose to reset their confirmation status and then resend the letter.

4.11.2 How to delete co-author response and resend letter

If an author contacts you because they have mistakenly entered that they are *not* a co-author of a submission, while in fact they are, you can delete their original answer and resend the confirmation request to the co-author as follows:

- Look up the manuscript and click on **Details**
- In the ‘Other Authors’ section, click on **Author Status**

- On the Author Status page, look up the author for whom you need to reset the response and click on **reset confirmation status** and then ‘OK.’ After that the status will change to ‘No Response’ and you should be able to resend the request for confirmation by clicking on **Resend Letter** and then on ‘Proceed.’

4.11.3 Co-author cannot see status of ms online

This is correct as only the Corresponding Author has access to this information and is responsible for keeping any co-authors informed. For full details on the information sent to co-authors, see above.
4.11.4 Co-author did not get the request to confirm their co-authorship
Please look up the ms and click on Details. Then check whether the co-author is listed in the ‘Other Authors’ section. Only authors that are listed there will have received the request so if the co-author is missing there, that is why they did not receive the letter. If they are listed on details as co-author, click on Author Status. On that page, you can check and if needed Edit the email address and resend the letter. The co-author may also want to check their spam folder as sometimes messages end up in there.

4.12 I see a green 'D' for a submission, what does that mean?
The system automatically recognizes whether the author may have submitted another paper to your EM site within the past year. If so, this will be flagged by way of a green ‘D’ (which stands for ‘duplicate’). Possible duplicates can be found by clicking on the author’s name and scrolling all the way down in the pop up window. That should give you a list of all mss submitted by the author as a corresponding author using that same account. If there were any other papers submitted by that author in the past year, the ‘D’ will show up, so it may well be an entirely different paper that was submitted (and hence not a problem). If the author’s name in the ms table is not hyperlinked, you can click on the author name via ms details.

The ‘D’ can also be triggered by the duplicate submission check; this is an automated check within the journal that checks the current ms against title, abstract and authors (submission data check only) and shows you the % of overlap. The check results can be accessed via the Duplicate Submission Check action link. In the end, it is up to you to decide whether the potential duplicates found by the system are indeed problematic. For instance, if the same author submitted 2 completely different papers within a year, there will still be a 100% score for author similarity.

4.13 Same submission appears multiple times in EM, how to handle?
Sometimes, it happens that an author submits the same paper multiple times. An easy way to quickly check for duplicates is clicking on the author’s name (if the name is not clickable in the ms overview, you can click on the details action link and then click on the author’s name at the top of the details page). This should open the people information page and if you scroll down to the bottom, you should find all papers submitted by that person as corresponding author. The system automatically checks back 1 year for any duplicates and if it finds any, will display a green D (which stands for ‘duplicate’). In addition, you can check the Duplicate Submission Check action link – the system does an automatic check (within the journal’s EM site only) for overlap in terms of authors, abstract and article title which results in a ‘duplicate submission check score’ (percentage). In the end, the editors will always need to make their own assessment as to whether the other papers listed are in fact problematic (e.g., if an author submits two completely different papers the system will come back with a 100% author similarity score even though this is not a problem).

If you discover duplicate submissions while the duplicates are all still in (Direct-to-Editor) New Submissions Requiring Assignment, you can simply keep the most recent one and use the Remove Submission action link to remove the duplicates.

If one or more of the duplicates have already been assigned to an editor or even sent for review, please double check whether both versions are the same. If they are, to minimize disruption, we suggest to retain the submission that has the most activity (e.g., already reviewers invited/agreed/reviews submitted) and for the other(s), set the final disposition to ‘withdrawn’ so as to deactivate these submissions. Setting the final disposition to withdrawn does not trigger any emails, so if there are active editors/reviewers associated with that particular submission, you may wish to contact them separately. We suggest to also add editorial notes to all papers concerned referring to the other duplicates by ms nr and explaining that due to ms X, Y, Z being duplicates, ms X & Y have been set to withdrawn and you will proceed with the ms under the remaining ms nr Z. Editorial notes like these can be added via details. About halfway down the details page you will find a text box called ‘Manuscript Notes.’ Any notes you add here are only visible for editors. If you add notes here, we advise adding your initials as well as the current date to your note, and make sure that the ‘Display Manuscript Notes Flag’ checkbox immediately above is ticked before you save your changes. The latter will trigger the display of a little red triangle next to details and should serve as a visual alert to editors that you have editorial notes stored for the submission.

If there are differences between the duplicates, we suggest to either retain the most recent version, or if you want to proceed with a different version instead, you can choose to copy the files from the most recent version (via File
Inventory) and update the submission that you want to proceed with as needed (you can use Edit Submission for the remaining submission to update the submission data as well as the submission files).

If you need further assistance with this, please do feel free to contact EM Support.

4.14 I want authors to suggest reviewers; what are the options?
By default, authors are already able to include suggestions for reviewers during the submission process via the ‘Author Comments’ box (on the editor's end this box is accessible via Details -> ‘Author Comments’ box at the top). Or they can include a cover letter in their submission with such information.

It is also possible to receive these suggestions in a more structured way, but that would require a bit more work for the author, as this would involve the author adding specific suggestions for reviewers as separate information during the submission process. If you would like to make use of this option, please contact EM Support. The upside here is that the system can then search for these reviewers through invite reviewers and if you look for reviewers yourself, the system will also flag whether they were suggested or opposed by the author. Potential downsides: Asking the authors for more information during submission can be experienced as having extra hoops to jump through and as a result may backfire so we would suggest to only add such additional steps if you feel they are really needed. Also, be aware that you will always need to do some fact-checking before actually inviting suggested referees (or agreeing not to send a ms to opposed referees) as some authors will suggest their family, friends and co-authors and some authors can be very creative. Some other publishers apparently encountered cases where the author had suggested some high-profile researchers but instead of giving the editors these researchers’ actual email addresses, he created Gmail addresses in their names that were then unfortunately used by the editors to send the invitation to (see for instance this article).

Result: the author basically reviewed their own paper, and the editors accepted it on the reviewer's merit alone. So please do be careful with using the email addresses suggested by the author.

If this extra submission step were to be activated, the accompanying instructions would state that while the editors are asking for suggestions, this does not necessarily mean that the suggested referees will indeed be contacted, but that it may well help speed up the process.

4.15 Revisions
4.15.1 Author cannot send in revision (revise option unavailable)
If an author contacts you because they want to send in a revision but do not have the option to do so in their main menu, this may be due to a variety of causes. In most cases, the editor has missed a crucial step in the process and the system still thinks the editor and not the author is the one who should take the next step. If a submission has been sent for revision successfully, you should see that the status of the ms is shown as ‘revise’ and that the submission also shows up in your main menu under Submissions out for revision. If that is not the case:

- If the ms status is shown as for instance ‘with editor’ or ‘decision in process’ instead, this means that you or another editor has missed a step. Most likely, the Handling Editor still needs to submit the formal decision and/or send the official revise decision letter to the author. Start with clicking on the View Reviews and Comments action link of the manuscript. This should show the reviewers and editors involved with the submission per version of the ms. It should also show the decision letter as sent to the author. If you do not see any decision letter recorded for the current version, that means that it has not yet been sent and that is why the author cannot yet send in the revision. As soon as you have sent the decision letter, the author should be able to send the revision in via the website. Please note that if you have already sent a decision letter to the author using the Send Email action link, that this does not count as an official decision within the system. Official decisions and author notifications should always be logged using the Submit Editors Decision and Comments and/or Notify Author action links.

- The ms may still be under review: In this case, you can choose to cancel the pending reviews/invitations and submit editors decision and comments OR you can ask the author to send in the revision via email and you can replace the current system files with the new ones using edit submission (in which case you should of course also notify any active reviewers that the submission has been updated and that they will need to download the latest version).

- Sometimes editors submit an accept decision while still expecting the author to make some final revisions. Please note that in EM, the ‘Accept’ decision label means that the paper is fully ready for typesetting and neither
editors nor author need to make any further changes, so in that case, the author will also not be able to submit a revised version online. As long as you have not yet set the final disposition to ‘accept’ as well, you can use **rescind decision** to cancel the accept decision. You will then need to **submit a new (replacement) revise decision** and once you have notified the author for this revise decision, the author should be able to submit their revision online.

- The **ms** for which the author wants to send in a revised version was **rejected** or at one point the final disposition was set to **withdrawn**. In both cases, the revision option will be closed off for the author as the system would then not expect any further action on a ms from anyone as rejection and withdrawal both mean that the ms has been fully finalized. If you do want to allow the author to revise, you can use the **Initiate Rebuttal** action link – that will reopen the revision option for the author.

For full details on how to take the various actions described above, please see the Editor's Manual, sections 3.1.6, 3.1.6.2 (Edit Submission), 3.3.3 (Submit Editors Decision and Comments), 3.3.3.1 (Notify Author), 3.3.3.2 (Rescind Decision), 3.3.3.4 (Initiate Rebuttal).

### 4.15.2 Revision submitted as a new paper: how to fix?

If the author sends in a revised submission as a completely new submission, you have two choices:

1. **Ask the author to resubmit the revision as an actual revision of the previous submission and set the final disposition for the new submission to ‘Withdrawn’ to deactivate it.** When the revision comes in, you have all the versions, reviews, decisions and such available under the original ms number.

   If you want to be able to determine later on why you set the final disposition of the new submission to ‘withdrawn,’ you can make a note that the ms was actually a revision of ms nr X and that you have asked the author to resubmit as revision of that ms. Such editorial notes can be added via the details action link of the ms – about halfway down the page you will find a text box called ‘manuscript notes.’ That is where you can add confidential notes that should only be accessible for editors. Before saving your notes, make sure that the ‘Display ms notes flag’ check box immediately above is ticked as this will trigger a little red triangle to be displayed for the ms so as to remind you and other editors that there are editorial notes saved for the submission. It is also helpful to add your initials and date at the end of your comment so that you can easily determine afterwards who made the comment and when.

   If the author lets you know that they do not have the revision option available in their main menu, you may need to take action on your end to make this available – see also above for more details as to potential causes and solutions.

2. **The second option you have is to look up the original submission, set the final disposition to ‘withdrawn’ for that one and simply continue with the new version.** If you do so, the new submission does not include any information that this is in fact a revision, so in that case, we strongly suggest to add editorial notes in both submissions that submission B is a revision of submission A (how to add such notes is explained in point 1 above). If you send the new ms out for review, you may also wish to inform the reviewers that this is in fact a revision and refer them to the previous ms number so that they can retrieve their comments for the original submission.

### 4.15.3 Author sent revised ms via email, how do I get this in EM?

If you receive a revision via email, you can either ask the author to submit the revision online or you can submit this online on behalf of the author by use of the proxy option. For more details on this proxy option, see the Editor's Manual, section 2.2.2.

If author does not have the option to submit a revision, you may well have missed a step on your end and may need to take further action in order to make the online revision option available for the author; please see above for more details as to potential causes and solutions.
**4.16  Edit Submission by editor**

If you only need to download the ms source files, please use the File Inventory action link. The Edit Submission option is intended for making changes to the submission PDF that you find under View Submission and/or the submission data that you see displayed on the website itself (e.g., article title, authors, article type, etc.) If you use Edit Submission, be aware that this process usually involves setting the system to create a new version of the submission PDF and that you then need to View and Approve the new submission. If you miss either of these steps, the ms will show up in your main menu under either Incomplete Submissions or Submissions waiting for approval. In either case you will need to take action as if you leave this as is, you may encounter technical issues for instance when you try to send the ms for review, or submit a decision. If you do not remember why you pressed Edit Submission in the first place, simply click revert submission to reinstate the original submission PDF. Otherwise, use Edit Submission to finish the process, or if the new PDF is already available, View Submission and then Approve Submission. For full details on how to use Edit Submission, see the Editor’s Manual, section 3.1.6.

**4.16.1 I got an email asking me to check the PDF that I edited, but I have not edited anything and cannot find the referenced folders in my main menu either**

Unfortunately, this alert is sent to all editors associated with the ms. If you did not click on edit submission yourself and do not find an incomplete/waiting for approval folder in your main menu, you will not need to do anything.

**4.16.2 When I use edit submission, and PDF is built for approval, who needs to approve the new PDF, me or the author?**

Approving the new PDF of the submission is a task for the editor who edited the submission. You should find it in Submissions waiting for approval in your main menu. Because by using edit submission you are basically making changes to the PDF that is available for the author, reviewers and editors, the system really wants you to check whether the new PDF is indeed okay (View Submission), and then to formally confirm (Approve Submission) that this new version should be used going forward.

**4.17 Author wants to change OA choice**

When an author submits a ms via Editorial Manager, they are asked whether or not they would like to have their paper published in Open Access (for Full Open Access journals, they will always need to choose ‘yes’). If they chose ‘Yes’ here, and you eventually set the final disposition to ‘Accept’ in order to send the ms on to the Desk Editor at Brill, the author will at that point automatically get a payment request from Rightslink through which they can pay the Open Access invoice. By using Rightslink, we can make sure that any discounts that may apply for the author are automatically taken into account.

If an author contacts you that they want to change their choice for Open Access, it depends on the current status of the ms how this can still be changed:

- **If a ms is still with the editor** and you expect it will still need revision by the author, simply let the author know that they can change their choice themselves when uploading their revised ms.

- **If you have not yet accepted** the ms and set the final disposition but expect to accept the ms (so no further revision by the author), you can change the author’s choice via Edit Submission -> Edit the Submission Data Only. The Open Access choice is listed at the top of the page and you can change the selection as appropriate).
When done, click ‘Submit’ and on the subsequent pages, also on ‘Submit’ (3 times in total).

- If you have already accepted the ms, but not yet set the final disposition to ‘accept,’ please contact EM Support. We can still update the author's choice before you set the final disposition.

- If the final disposition has already been set to ‘Accept,’ please contact the journal's Desk Editor and openaccess@brill.com. They can then arrange that the final publication ends up as intended and that any invoices are handled as well (depending on the change, this may involve the invoice being cancelled or a new invoice created manually).

4.18 Proposals/Author invitation option

Editorial Manager allows you to invite authors to submit a manuscript and to keep track of these invitations and connected submissions through the system. This can be an interesting feature for instance if you are actively soliciting manuscripts for a Special Issue or book reviews (book reviewers are considered authors in EM as they are expected to submit material that is intended to be published, in contrast to referees/peer reviewers who are asked to provide the editor with advice as to whether or not a paper should be published and how it could be improved to get it in publishable shape. The reviewer's advice is not intended to be published.). For full details on how this feature works, please see the Editor's Manual, section 4.

4.18.1 How to change submission deadline (ms invited via proposal)

You can update the date for when you would like the author to respond to your invitation (agree/decline) as well as the deadline for actual submission of the ms both before you send out the invitation and afterwards. Full details on how the author invitation process works can be found in section 4 of the Editor's Manual.

If you are still in the process of sending the invitations, on the page where you need to confirm the letters you wish to send, you will also find two date fields that contain the deadline for when you would like to have the author's agree/decline response as well as their submission. You can change the dates in there as needed before you click on 'submit' to send the actual invitation letter(s).

If you already sent the invitation letter, you can still update the various deadlines via the details action link of the related proposal:

- Go to the 'proposal menu' tab in your editorial main menu and go to My Pending Proposals.
- Click on Details and scroll down to see the invited authors, current status and deadlines. The deadlines recorded here are the ones that are used for the central reminder reports (you can send reminders where needed using Send Reminder Letters at the bottom of your editorial main menu). For each invited author, you will find a ‘Date Response Due’ deadline (i.e., the deadline for when you expect them to say yes/no to the invitation; as soon as they respond, this deadline field will disappear) and a ‘Date Submission Due’ deadline (this is the date by which you would expect them to send in the actual ms). To change the deadlines, you can either use the calendar icon or type
over the current deadlines (as long as you keep to the current format, which is month/day/year). To save the changes, click on ‘Save’ or ‘Save and Close’ at the bottom of the page.

Regardless of the deadline that is shown in EM, the authors will still be able to send in an invited submission online as long as their status is shown as ‘invited’ or ‘agreed.’

4.18.2 I invited authors via EM (proposals menu) – how do I cancel any pending invitations?
To cancel pending author invitations, you can look up the proposal, and click on Invite Authors. That will show you all authors associated with the proposal. By clicking on the relevant uninvite/unassign link you can cancel an individual invitation.

4.18.3 Proposal is finished – how to deactivate in EM?
If a proposal is finished, or needs to be deactivated for a different reason, please look up the proposal via the ‘Proposal Menu’ tab in your main menu, and click Set Final Disposition and select either ‘Completed Proposal’ or ‘Withdrawn Proposal’ and ‘Proceed.’ If the system will not let you do this because there are open author invitations or assignments, please cancel these first (see above for further instructions). Once these open assignments have been cancelled, you should be able to finalize the proposal.

5. Collaboration with other editors
If your journal has multiple editors, each editor will need to be added to the system and each editorial role will have specific tasks and permissions in the system, allowing the editors to work together as best as possible. A quick workflow guide can be found here and should give you an impression of the various workflow steps in EM. If you want to know the exact workflow configured for your journal, please contact EM Support.

5.1 I would like to use the discussion forum to discuss a ms with other editors or board members, how does that work?
You can use the discussion option to ask one or more of the other editors or board members for general advice (e.g., Does this still fall within the scope? Can you suggest reviewers for this paper?). The feature is not intended to ask for in-depth reviews (if you are expecting detailed review comments that you may wish to eventually share with the authors it is better to invite someone as a reviewer instead). You can find full details as to how the discussion works in section 3.7.1 of the Editor’s Manual.

Editors who should be able to act as Handling Editors (e.g., Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, Guest Editor, etc.) are available as potential discussion participants by default. Some journals, however, also like to be able to use this to more actively involve their wider advisory board. If you want to be able to involve your board members through this option as well and do not see them listed as possible discussion participants, please contact EM Support. If your board members are listed but the list is incorrect or incomplete, please also contact EM Support.
5.2 How to change Handling Editor

There are various options to change the Handling Editor for a manuscript and it may depend on the action folder the paper is in and the editorial role that you have which options are available to you:

- **Assign Editor:** this allows you to forward the paper to another editor for handling, but will keep you in the loop for that paper. For more details, see the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.9.
- **Unassign Editor:** this allows you to make changes to the editor(s) assigned to the manuscript. Please note that if you fully unassign all editors associated with the submission, the ms will go back to New/Revised Submissions Requiring Assignment and you will need to assign another handling editor using Assign Editor (if no editor has been assigned to the ms, it will not be possible for an editor to submit a formal decision or send the ms for review). For more details on Unassign Editor, see the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.9.1.
- **Redirect to Other Editor:** If incoming manuscripts are automatically divided between you and (an)other editor(s), you can reroute the paper to one of the other receiving editors via the Redirect to Other Editor action link. You will then no longer be involved in the online editorial process for that paper.

If you need further assistance with rerouting a submission, please do not hesitate to contact EM Support.

5.2.1 Editor is unable to assign other editor

If you are unable to assign a ms to an editor, this may have a variety of causes:

- The **new/revised ms** you are trying to assign has **not yet been submitted**. To check whether this is the case, look at the status of the submission: 'Incomplete,' '(Revision) Needs Approval,' 'Sent Back to Author,' 'Rebuttal,' 'Revise,' 'Author Declines to Revise' are all statuses that indicate that the submission is still with the author and without the author taking the next step, you as editor will not be able to do anything (other than taking that step on the author's behalf using the proxy option).
- The **editor** that you are trying to assign is **already assigned** to the ms. Check ms **Details:** If you find the editor you are trying to assign already listed on the bottom half of the details page, they are already assigned and should be able to take action as needed. If need be, you can resend the original assignment letter via the ms **History** (the bottom half of the History page contains the submission's correspondence archive; simply look up the letter, click on the letter's name and 'resend').
- You are not the current handling editor: **only the handling editor can assign** a submission on to other editors.
- If you use the **Unassign Editor** option, when reassigning the submission to a **different type of editor**, be aware that you may need to adjust the **role type** drop down menu in the middle first before the editor you are looking for becomes available in the relevant drop down menu on the right
- You do **not have system permissions to assign** ms to editors
- The **editor** you are trying to assign was actually **already assigned and has already submitted a decision** for that version of the submission. In such cases, EM does not allow the editor to be reassigned for that ms version (as the editor has already finished their task by submitting the decision), but you can **rescind decision** if needed. This will cancel the decision taken by the editor and will automatically move the submission back to their main menu. As their original decision was rescinded, they will at one point need to submit a new (replacement) decision.
- The **editor** that you want to assign **does not have an editor role in the system** (or an editor role that is currently not intended to act as Handling Editor and hence cannot receive any assignments). Please contact EM Support.
- Your journal has a so-called 'direct-to-editor' workflow where incoming submissions are automatically divided between multiple editors. In that case, if you find the ms still in **Direct-to-Editor New/Revised Submissions**, you will need to assign the ms to yourself first before you can assign it to anyone else. The only other option you have there is the Redirect to Other Editor option that allows you to send the paper to another editor who can receive submissions directly from the author (so this does not give you the option to send to *any* editor) – if you use that option, you will be completely taken out of the loop for that submission.

If you need further assistance with this, please feel free to contact EM Support.
5.2.2 Not all current editors are in EM / former editors still appear in EM
If the list with editors available for assignment in EM is incorrect or incomplete, please contact the journal's Acquisitions Editor and EM Support.

5.3 I would like to change some of the workflow settings
Please contact EM Support to discuss the points you would like to have changed. Even though we may not be able to change everything, in many cases it will be possible to tweak the system further so that it will be as helpful as possible for you. It is for instance possible to change system letters and deadlines.

6. Review process
6.1 How does the review process work in EM?
The review process in EM works as follows:

1. First an editor sends a formal invitation to a reviewer. As editor, you can edit (customize) the invitation letter on a case-by-case basis. If you end up making the same changes every time, please contact EM Support as we can also update the system letters for you in the back end. Likewise, default deadlines for reviewers are set in the back end of EM and may differ per article type; as editor, you can change these on a case-by-case basis. If the default deadlines should be changed, though, please contact EM Support. Deadlines for reviewers are calculated based on the day they actually agree to review.

2. The reviewer declines or accepts either online, or via the accept/decline links in the invitation letter. They will always get an official confirmation of the choice they made. If you have specific instructions for reviewers that you want them to take note of when reviewing, feel free to contact EM Support to have these inserted into the default 'Thank you for agreeing to review' letter. There is a Reviewer Manual available for reviewers explaining how the process works in Editorial Manager. A link to this is available next to the login box on the EM login page. In addition, we have general guidelines for reviewers, which explain what is generally expected of reviewers (how to review). A link to this document is included in the online Reviewer Manual.

3. Once the reviewer has finished their review, this has to be submitted online. The only part required in that process is picking a short recommendation from the drop down menu. In addition, by default, there are two plain text boxes they can use to paste their comments in (one for confidential comments to the editors, and one for comments to the authors), and they can choose to upload an attachment to accompany their review. This is the default functionality. After submission of their review, the reviewer automatically gets a confirmation of receipt and the Handling Editor should also receive an alert that a review has been submitted.

6.1.1 Reviewer asks about general guidelines on how to review (not how EM works!)
As you may know, we have a Reviewer's Manual available on how EM works, which can be accessed via the EM login page (to the right of the login box), but some reviewers may also want some more detailed information as to what is expected from them as a reviewer in general (e.g., how to review, what to look out for, etc.). For that purpose, we have also more general review guidelines available which you can find here.

6.2 How to change the nr of required reviews/skip review altogether
As the editor, you are of course the one to decide whether or not a paper to be reviewed at all and if so, how many reviews are needed for that particular paper. There are system defaults set per article type so that in principle, the number of required reviews will be okay, but if needed, you can always change the number of required reviews on a case-by-case basis. After all, if a paper is clearly out of scope, it need not be reviewed, or if you have received two conflicting reviews, you may well want to try and obtain a third review for balance before taking a decision.

If no reviews are needed at all, you can simply proceed with submitting a decision (Submit Editor's Decision and Comments).

If you do need reviews, but a different number than is currently indicated for the paper, please click on the Invite Reviewers action link of the ms. At the top of the page, in the 'Review Settings section,' the number entered in the first line determines how many reviews are needed for that paper and hence when it will pop up in your main menu as
having all reviews complete, needing additional reviewers, etc. To change the number of required reviews, simply click on the Change link, update the number and ‘Save and Close.’ If you keep changing the number because the default settings are incorrect for your journal, please contact EM Support.

6.3 I want to send ms for review, but do not seem to have the option?
In order to be able to send a new or newly revised ms for review (or to submit a formal decision), you will always need to assign the ms to yourself first using the Assign Editor action link for the ms. Even if you are the only editor working for the journal, you will still need to assign the ms to yourself. So if you see that the ms is still in New/Revised Submissions Requiring Assignment (or in Direct-to-Editor New/Revised Submissions) you simply missed the ‘Assign Editor’ step and that is why you are unable to send the ms for review.

As soon as you have assigned yourself as editor, the ms will move to New Assignments in your main menu and from there, you should be able to send the ms for review (Invite Reviewers). For more information on these actions, including screenshots please see the Editor's Manual, sections 3.1.9 (Assign Editor) and 3.3.1 (Invite Reviewers).

6.4 How to access info on reviewers suggested by author
Sometimes, authors may suggest reviewers for a submission. By default, they can only do so by including their suggestions in a separate cover letter included in the submission PDF (check View Submission) or by inserting these in the author comments box (check the top of the details page).

It is, however, also possible to switch on a separate submission step for the authors in which they are specifically asked to suggest reviewers (contact EM Support for activation). The upside of this would be that the system can then automatically search for these suggested reviewers through Invite Reviewers and if you do a manual reviewer search, the system will also flag if that person was suggested or opposed by the author. However, be aware that introducing extra steps for the authors during submission can be experienced as having extra hoops to jump through and as a result may backfire so we would suggest to only add steps that you think are really needed.

If switched on, you can find the suggested reviewers on the PDF cover page of the Editor's version of the submission as well as on the Invite Reviewers page (under Author's Reviewer Preferences), and you can change the search type on the Invite Reviewers page from ‘Search from reviewers’ to ‘Suggested by author’ (the latter should display the suggested reviewers in so far already registered in EM).

Regardless of how the author suggests reviewers, if you as the editor wish to make use of these, please review them carefully before proceeding, as some authors will suggest their family, friends and co-authors and some authors are very creative. See for instance this article where the author had suggested some high-profile researchers but instead of giving the editors these researchers’ actual email addresses, the author had created Gmail addresses for them, which were then unfortunately used by the editors. As a result, the author could basically review their own paper, and the editors accepted it on the reviewer's merit alone.

6.5 I would like to search for board members when inviting reviewers, but can only do this by specific names. How can I simply search for anyone who is a board member?
Please contact EM Support: we can create a ‘Board Member’ people flag for you (green letter ‘E’). Once activated, you can easily connect this flag to the user accounts of the various board members and can search for any people associated with this particular flag on any people search pages, including the invite reviewers page (in which case, simply switch the search ‘Criterion’ to ‘People Flag Name,’ pick ‘Editorial Board Member’ as ‘Value’ and ‘Search.’
6.6 I want to send a revised submission for review; how does that work?
Inviting reviewers for a revision basically works the same as inviting them for a new submission so you can use the Invite Reviewers action link for this. The only difference is that for revisions, the system will automatically search for the original reviewers (if there were any) when you click the ‘Go’ button. If you want to be able to search for and invite other reviewers, simply change the selection in the drop down menu at the top from ‘Select from Previous Reviewers’ to ‘Search for Reviewers’ and then press ‘Go’ to get the regular search grid). See also the Editor’s Manual, section 3.3.1.1.

6.7 I sent a reviewer invitation, but cannot find this in the system, what went wrong?
If you officially invited a reviewer via EM or queued one for invitation (alternate reviewer), you should see these listed as such when you click on details and scroll down to the bottom half of the page – there you should see all the reviewers associated with the submission as well as their current status). If you do not find the reviewer there, please check the History action link and scroll down to look in the correspondence archive for correspondence to that reviewer. If you do not find an invitation letter to that reviewer (“REVIEWER: Invitation to Review”), it has not been sent and you will need to go back to Invite Reviewers and invite that person.

Please be aware that if the first time around, the reviewer was not yet available in the system and you used Register and Select New Reviewer to add them to the system and send them an invitation, that you needed to send two letters to the reviewer: the first one to notify them about their registration and the second to actually invite them to review this particular manuscript. We have noticed that the initial registration notification letter sometimes causes some confusion, as the editor then assumes that this is the review invitation and that sending this completes the review invitation process, whereas in fact, they then still need to actually invite the reviewer to review as well. Unfortunately, we cannot cut the registration notice out of the process as due to the European Privacy Law (GDPR) we are legally to notify people when they are added to a database such as EM. If you want, you can choose to edit the initial registration notice and add a quick note that an invitation to review will follow separately. You only need to register someone in EM once and hence sending the registration notice will not be needed next time you want to invite that person.

Another thing that may have gone wrong is that you came to the page where you can send the invitation letters and chose to customize the letter. After saving your customized version of the letter, you still need to press the ‘Confirm Selections and Proceed’ button in order to actually send the letters. If you miss that, the letter will not be sent.

For full details on how the reviewer invitation process works, please see the Editor’s Manual, section 3.3.1.

6.8 How to resend review invitation
How best to resend a review invitation depends on whether the reviewer still has an ‘invited’ status for the ms. You can easily check this by looking up the ms and clicking on Details: scroll down to the lower half of the page; if you find the reviewer listed there with an ‘invited’ or ‘agreed’ status, they are still active for the ms, in which case please follow the instructions in point 1 below. If they are not listed as active reviewer at all, or have an ‘uninvited,’ ‘unassigned’ or ‘declined’ status, you need to follow the steps described in point 2. If you sent an email to someone and it bounced because the email was incorrect, go to step 3 (and when done, either step 1 or 2, depending on the reviewer’s status for the ms).
1. **Reviewer still active for the ms (invited/agreed):** Open the History page, scroll down to the correspondence archive and look up the original invitation letter that was sent to the reviewer (or if they agreed, the ‘Thank you for agreeing to review’ letter). Click on the letter’s name to open it and then ‘Resend’.

2. **Reviewer not or no longer active (declined/uninvited/unassigned/not invited at all):** You will need to send them a completely new invitation via the Invite Reviewers action link. For details on the invitation process, please see the Editor’s Manual, section 3.3.1.

3. **Email address reviewer incorrect:** You will need to update the reviewer’s email address first via Search People: look up the reviewer, click on their name in the search results, update the email address and ‘submit’. Then follow the instructions in either step 1 or 2 above to resend the invitation letter – it will then be sent to the updated email address.

Note that if you wish to send a revised ms out for re-review, you can do so via Invite Reviewers the same way you would invite reviewers for a completely new ms. In case of a revision, though, the system will initially show you a list with the reviewers who reviewed the previous version of the ms as well. See the Editor’s Manual, section 3.3.1.1 for full details.

**6.9 Someone’s email address appears to be incorrect; how do I change this and resend the EM letters?**

If someone’s email turns out to be incorrect, you can update this by looking up the person via Search People: click on their name in the search results and scroll down: the email address will be displayed about halfway down in the ‘Personal Information’ section (and can be corrected there as well). Click ‘Submit’ at the bottom of the page to save your changes.

To resend the original system letter to the new address, look up the ms and click on the History action link – the bottom half of the History page contains the correspondence archive. Look up the letter and click on the letter’s name to open it. At the top of the letter page you will find a ‘resend’ button through which you can resend the original. It will automatically be resent to the updated email address. If you want to include a personal note, you can also use the ‘Edit and resend’ option.

**6.10 How does a reviewer agree/decline online in EM?**

A reviewer can agree or decline via the relevant link in the email invitation you sent. However, for security reasons, these direct agree/decline links will automatically expire after 3 clicks/5 days (whichever comes first). After that, the reviewer can still log into their Reviewer main menu and agree or decline in there. Review invitations will be shown under New Reviewer Invitations. Once they have agreed to review, the ms will move to Pending Assignments and from there, they can download the reviewer PDF and eventually submit their review. Full details on how the system works for reviewers can be found in the Reviewers Manual.

**6.10.1 How to change reviewer status when reviewer contacts editor outside EM**

When a reviewer contacts you outside of EM to let you know that they do or do not want to review, you can ask the reviewer to also indicate this in the system, but you can also enter this information into EM on their behalf by proxying for them. For more information on how to proxy, see the Editor’s Manual, section 2.2.2. For more information on how a reviewer agrees/declines, see above.

**6.11 Reviewers are complaining to me that they can see the author's name. That is not supposed to be the case.**

Please check the File Inventory action link: if your journal has been set up with a double blind review policy, you will at least see ‘Title Page’ and ‘Manuscript (anonymized)’ listed in the ‘Item’ column. By default, the system does not include any files that have any of the ‘item’ labels ‘Cover Letter,’ ‘Title Page,’ ‘Biographical Note,’ ‘Supplemental’ in the PDF that is shared with the reviewer. However, the system cannot check whether the contents of the various files match what you may expect based on the name of the associated ‘item’ – that is something the editor who initially receives the paper should check upon submission. So if the ‘Manuscript (anonymized)’ file includes the name of the author, that is what the reviewer will get to see as well. If need be, you can always edit the submission on the editorial side to anonymize it. This involves downloading the source files, fixing them, and then replacing the current source files with
the corrected ones and then rebuilding and approving the new submission PDF – please see section 3.1.6 in the Editor's Manual for more details on how to edit submission.

If you have any doubts, please do not hesitate to contact EM Support to make sure the EM site is indeed set up for double blind review. While the vast majority of Brill’s journals have a double blind review policy, some are set up as single blind (where reviewers can see the author’s name).

6.12 How to change review deadlines
You can update review deadlines on a case-by-case basis via invite reviewers (right before you actually send the invitation letters) or via the details action link of the manuscript (if the reviewer has already been invited or queued as an alternate reviewer). For more details on this, see section 3.3.1.2 in the Editors Manual.

Should you wish to have the default settings updated, EM Support can take care of this for you in the system’s back end so in that case, please send a request to EM@brill.com. When doing so, please include the name or acronym of the journal and let us know which settings you would like to change. If you want, you can have different deadlines per article type, and different deadlines for reviewing original ms versions, and revised versions.

6.13 How to cancel pending reviews/invitations
If you have an open review invitation or pending review and you wish to cancel this for whatever reason, you can do so by looking up the ms and clicking on Invite Reviewers. You will then see an overview of all the reviewers associated with the ms and for still active reviewers (invited/agreed), you will see an Uninvite or Unassign link after their name. To cancel the review / review invitation, simply click on that link and send the accompanying letter. See also section 3.3.1.3 in the Editors Manual.

6.14 I want to remove a reviewer from the database or flag a reviewer as ‘do not contact’; how does that work?
Removing someone's account may not be the most helpful way as then you also lose any information that someone should no longer be contacted, and therefore you run the risk that at one point in the future, an editor will create a new account for that person and just send them a new invitation. That being said, though, if a reviewer (or author) insists on being removed from our database, we are legally obliged to do so due to the European privacy law GDPR. Removing user accounts can only be done by EM Support, so in that case, please forward the reviewer's request to EM@brill.com.

If the reviewer agrees to have their user record retained in EM, please look up their user account via Search People and click on their name in the search results to make the following changes:

- **Change the email address** to ‘do-not-contact@unknown.xx’. This way, if any editor ever does try and contact them, that editor will get a delivery failure and will hopefully understand from the email address that they should not try and contact this reviewer.

   - **Add a people note** that the person no longer wishes to be contacted for the journal and add your initials and the date between brackets at the end of your comment. These people notes will show up underneath the person’s name in the search results when you look up this reviewer via Invite Reviewers. This way, it should be clear that you should NOT proceed with inviting this reviewer.
   - **Click ‘Submit’** to save your changes.

   In addition, it is possible to activate the ‘Do not contact’ people flag, which when active for a user, will be shown next to the user’s name throughout the system whenever the name is shown as a hyperlink. To add a flag to a user, simply click on the flag symbol next to the user’s name, tick the appropriate box(es) and ‘submit.’ If you do not have the option to add people flags, or the flag you are looking for is not available, please contact EM Support.

1 Note that on the user account information page that you will then land on, you will also find the options ‘Available as Reviewer?’ and ‘Forbidden as Reviewer?’ in the ‘User Information’ section at the top. These options should not be used as if you were to set ‘Available as Reviewer?’ to ‘No’ and/or ‘Forbidden as Reviewer?’ to ‘Yes,’ the person would no longer show up in the default search for reviewers and hence you may assume the reviewer is not yet in the database and risk creating a duplicate account.
6.15 How to send reminders?
As editor, if you scroll down to the bottom of your main menu, you will find a link called Send Reminder Letters. Through that link you can easily pull up lists with authors and reviewers who are late with responding to an invitation or submitting a revision/review and send reminders where needed via the system. If you do not want to send a reminder to someone via EM, for instance because you will be talking to that person soon anyway, you can still use the list to see where follow up may be needed and also choose to follow up by phone, in person, etc. For detailed information on the various reminder reports and how they work, please see the Editor's Manual, section 3.16.

6.15.1 Is it possible to send automatic reminders?
By default, the system does NOT send out automated reminders, nor does it automatically cancel pending invitations/assignments. The reason why this is not activated by default is because in the past, automated reminders tended to cause more trouble than they are worth as it frequently happens that reviewers contact the editor asking for an extension, the editor then grants that, and before the time is up the system sends an automated reminder. Result: angry reviewers, and it may take more time to appease them than sending out the reminders manually. Some reviewers may get so angry that they will no longer agree to review for the journal at all.

The system provides a reporting option (send reminder letters -> reviewer no response report & reviewer reminder report) that allows you to draw a list with all late reviewers in just a few clicks and send reminders where necessary so you will not need to remember yourself when a review is due to come in. With the list, you are flexible, in the sense that you can decide which reviewers to remind and when so that when you have just granted someone an extension you can choose to skip the reminder. More information on the various reminder reports and how they work can be found in the online editor's manual, section 3.16.

In the end, the reminder reports will allow you to respond faster as they will give you good insights into your reviewers: at one point you may notice that the same reviewers are always late, some of whom may still deliver, but others may never deliver, so then you could decide never to use that person for review anymore, thus saving time on future submissions. Or you may decide in such cases to leave the review assignment open (if the review comes in before you secure another it would still be welcome), but also try and secure another review to speed up the process.

Similarly, having pending invitations and assignments disabled automatically may also cause quite some annoyance with your reviewers. They may have been out of office for a short period of time and may not even have had a chance to respond to the initial request.

If you do want to have automated review reminders set up for your journal, please contact EM Support. In that case, we will need to know which type(s) of reminders you want to have sent and at which time(s) (e.g., invitation reminder 5 and 10 days after invitation; courtesy reminder 1 week before review deadline; late review reminder 7 and 14 days after review deadline).

6.15.1.1 How do I postpone/skip automated reminders for an individual reviewer / manuscript?
If your journal is making use of automated review reminders, you can postpone these by adjusting the review deadline via the details action link of the ms. If you scroll down on the details page, you will find all associated reviewers listed on the bottom half and can update their deadlines there as well. Make sure to save your changes after changing the deadline.

If your journal is also using automated cancellations of review invitations / assignments, you can make changes to this on a case-by-case basis as well by clicking on Invite Reviewers for the ms. At the top of the Invite Reviewers page, in the ‘Review Settings’ section at the top, you can use the appropriate change link to make changes for all reviewers connected to that particular ms:

- Automatically un-invite Reviewers who do not respond to an invitation within X days. [If X is set to 0, there is NO automated uninvitation; otherwise reviewers are automatically uninvited after the nr of days indicated if they have not agreed/declined by that time]
- Automatically un-assign Reviewers who do not complete a review within X days of the review due date. [If X is set to ‘0,’ there is NO automated cancellation of pending reviews; if set to any other number, then the system automatically cancels the pending review so many days after the review deadline.]
6.16 ‘Partial review saved’: What does this mean, and how can I get this completed?
The ‘partial review saved’ status for a reviewer means that the reviewer has started uploading a review but has not yet completed the process. It may be that it is still incomplete, but it may also be that the reviewer simply missed a step and thinks the review has already been submitted. We therefore recommend simply contacting the reviewer and asking whether the review is complete, and if so, to submit the final version online. You can also proxy for the reviewer to see what is in the system and if this looks complete, submit this on the reviewer’s behalf in order to speed up matters. If you need more information on how to proxy, please see the Editors Manual, section 2.2.2. Reviews can be submitted in the reviewer main menu via Pending Assignments -> Submit Recommendation.

6.17 Editing / Reopening reviews
If you need to edit a review that has already been completed, you can do this on the editorial side by looking up the ms and then clicking on View Reviews and Comments. If you then open the individual review by clicking on the reviewer’s short recommendation (e.g., Minor Revision), you will find an Edit Review Comments link at the top. Through that link you should be able to update all elements of the review as needed – please do make sure that there is always a short recommendation selected for the review when editing and to click ‘Save and Close’ when ready to save your changes. When you use this option, you have full control as to what is edited and when as the review stays on your side. Detailed instructions for how to edit reviews, including screenshots, can be found in the Editors Manual, section 3.3.1.4.

You can also choose to return the review to the reviewer so that the reviewer can edit the review themselves and resubmit when done. This option is not by default available for all journals so if you would like to have this switched on, please contact EM Support.

Note that the author only gets to see the review comments that you include in the decision letter, so you can also choose to edit the review comments in the ‘Comments to Author’ field when submitting your decision and/or on the ‘Notify Author’ page.

7. Decision process
7.1 I can only see a PDF, but I need to have a Word file for editing, why is that not included?
EM asks the author to supply original source files (Word, tiff, jpg, etc.) and the system then converts and compiles these into a single PDF that is made available under View Submission. The original source files can be downloaded via the File Inventory action link. If you only find PDF files on the File Inventory page, that is all the author provided and hence, you will need to contact the author for the original Word files.

7.2 How do I access the manuscript source files?
A PDF of the entire submission can be downloaded via View Submission. If you need to access the original source files, however, you find these under File Inventory. If you only find PDF files on the File Inventory page, that is all the author provided and hence, you will need to contact the author for the original Word files.

7.3 How to send reviews on to author / submit decision and notify author
In order to send reviews on to the author, you will need to submit a formal decision, and at the end of the process, the author needs to be formally notified of the decision. Submitting your decision is done via the Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments action link. Depending on the workflow for your journal, you are the one to notify the author of the decision as part of the process, or your decision is automatically forwarded to another editor who then has to notify the author. Detailed information on how to submit a decision can be found in the Editors Manual, section 3.3.3. If you are in an editorial position where you may need to ‘approve’ decisions taken by other editors and eventually need to notify the author about an editorial decision, you will find these to-be-approved decisions in either of the following folders and depending on which one they land in, the action you need to take differs slightly:

1. Submissions with Required Reviews Complete (status: decision in process). Action to take: Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments (notify author should be part of the decision process).
2. All Submissions with Editors Decision (near the bottom of your main menu, you may need to scroll down to see this; status: decision in process). Action to take: Notify Author.
If you need information on the current workflow for your journal, please contact [EM Support](#). Please note that if you intend to accept a paper and the paper still needs copyediting, you should take care of that before submitting the final accept decision in EM (see also below for details on how to handle final acceptance and copyediting).

In general, it is best to wait until all the reviews you need are in, before sending these on to the author. Not only because when you submit a decision you would need to cancel any reviews that are still pending, but more importantly, because sometimes reviewers send in conflicting advice and if you would for instance already have forwarded the positive advice to the author, a later negative review may put you in an awkward position (plus for the author it is worse because he/she can never make the best and most balanced decision. That being said, as editor, you have full control as to how many reviews are actually needed for a paper and may deviate from the default number at any time. If you do want to give the author advance access to a review, you can always copy and paste this into a separate email. Note, though, that the author will never be able to submit a revised version online if you have not submitted a formal revise decision and notified the author as part of the decision process.

If you are unable to submit a decision in the system because the Submit Editor's Decision and Comments link is unavailable, please check the section below for potential causes.

### 7.3.1 Cannot submit decision

If you are unable to submit an editorial decision in the system (which needs to be done using the Submit Editor's Decision and Comments action link), this may have a variety of causes:

- If you are viewing a manuscript and related information via the View All Assigned Submissions folder in your main menu, be aware that this is intended as a tracking folder rather than an action folder, and as a consequence, you may not have all the potential action options in that folder. To be able to take any action needed on a submission, it is best to either access the submission by looking it up via Search Submissions or one of the action folders in your main menu (Editor's To Do List section at the top, and if applicable, All Submissions with Editor's Decision near the bottom of your main menu – you may need to scroll down to see the latter).
- You are not the Handling Editor for the submission (check the 'Handling Editor' column for this when accessing the submission via Search Submissions). Only the Handling Editor can submit a decision.
- The ms still has pending reviews or pending review invitations. That does not necessarily mean that you cannot submit a decision, but this would then involve an extra step at the start where you need to 'terminate' these open assignments before you can proceed with submitting the decision. Note that if you still want these reviews to come in, it is best to hold off on your decision until they are ready.
- The ms has not yet been assigned to any editor (status: 'Submitted to Journal' / 'Revision Submitted to Journal'). If a submission is still shown in New/Revised Submissions Requiring Assignment or Direct-to-Editor New/Revised Submissions, you will need to ensure the paper is assigned to an editor. Even if you are the only editor for a journal, you still need to assign the ms to yourself first. Revisions also need to be assigned to an editor. Once assigned, the paper will go to your New Assignments folder and from there you should be able to Submit Editor's Decision and Comments.
- The ms has an 'incomplete with editor' or '(revised) PDF needs editor approval' status. This will cause technical issues when you try to take a decision, so you need to resolve that first. Once resolved, you should have no further trouble submitting your decision. For more information on how to resolve the incomplete/waiting for approval status, see below.
- The (revised) ms has not actually been submitted yet by the author. To check whether this is the case, look at the status of the submission: 'Incomplete,' '(Revision) Needs Approval,' ‘Sent Back to Author,’ 'Rebuttal,' 'Revise,' 'Author Declines to Revise' are all statuses that indicate that the submission is still with the author and without the author taking the next step, you as editor will not be able to do anything (other than taking that step on the author's behalf using the proxy option).

EM is pretty strict in the sense that you will need to finish one step before you can take the next one. Some steps can be skipped altogether if needed (e.g., you need not send a ms for peer review if clearly out of scope), others cannot (submit ms/revision -> assign editor -> submit decision & notify author -> for accepted mss, set final disposition to
‘Accept’). As you can see above, in many cases, someone simply missed a step. As always, if you cannot determine what is causing the issue, feel free to contact EM Support.

7.3.2 I do not agree with a reviewer's recommendation; can I take a different type of decision?
Yes, you should be able to submit any type of decision regardless of what the reviewer has recommended. Depending on the workflow for your journal, you can then also send the accompanying decision letter as part of the decision process OR your decision is forwarded to another editor who then needs to notify the author. On the decision page, you can add any comments you have for the author into the ‘Comments to Author’ box and can edit the review comments as needed; anything that is in the ‘Comments to Author’ box at the time you confirm your decision will automatically be inserted at the bottom of the decision letter so please make sure these comments are complete and that the reviews are properly anonymized. The editor who sends the decision letter to the author can still edit the letter and accompanying comments further if needed.

7.3.3 Is it possible to inform reviewers when I take a decision?
Yes, this is possible. For more information on what options you have to share information with reviewers and to activate these, please contact EM Support.

7.3.4 Is it possible to inform co-authors about decision?
Yes, you can inform co-authors about your editorial decision. The decision letter that is sent from EM is by default only sent to the corresponding author, but at the top of the page from which you send the decision letter (Notify Author page) you should have checkboxes available allowing you to indicate that co-authors should be cc-ed. Otherwise, you can manually add any email addresses that you wish to cc into the blank cc-fields on the Notify Author page.

Please note:
1. If you enter more than 1 email address in the blank cc-box, you should separate the email addresses by way of semicolons (;). E.g., ‘john@uni1.com;ellen@uni2.com’.
2. If you use the co-author cc checkbox, a cc will only be sent to co-authors listed as manuscript data (so shown on the Details page of the ms).
3. If there are co-authors included on details but you do not see the cc-box for co-authors on the Notify Author page, please contact EM Support.
4. If you would like to have co-authors cc-ed on all decision letters by default, that is also possible. In that case, please contact EM Support to get this set up for your journal.

7.3.5 How to share attachments with author
Reviewers as well as editors can upload file attachments into the system. This can be used to upload a file with extensive comments for the author, a marked up copy of the ms, etc. If there are attachments available for a ms, you can find these under the Attachments link that is available in various places within EM (you can find this link o.a. on the View Reviews and Comments page, on the page where you submit your decision, and on the Details page for the ms).
Attachments are by default treated as confidential information and if you want to share any you will need to tick the ‘Allow Author Access’ tick box for those files. If set to be shared, they will not be shared with the author until the decision letter has been sent. The system will then automatically insert an extra text into the decision letter informing the author that there are attachments and a link through which the author can download these. Be aware that the author will then be able to see the sanitized copy of the shared attachment(s), as well as whatever is included in the related ‘Description’ and ‘File Name’ fields so if there are any clues to the reviewer’s identity included there, we advise to either upload a fully anonymized version of the file and share that instead of the original one or if possible, to simply copy and paste the contents of the file into the decision letter. For full details on how the attachments option works, see the Editors Manual, section 3.3.2.

Should you have forgotten to share an attachment with the author before sending the decision letter, you can still do so: simply look up the ms, click on View Reviews and Comments and then on Attachments and tick the ‘Allow Author Access’ check box and save the changes. Obviously, the decision letter will not be updated to include the extra text and link, but you can let the author know separately that they can then download the attachment(s) by logging in as an
author. The ms will be in Submissions Needing Revision and they should be able to download the file(s) via the View Attachments action link.

7.3.5.1 How to upload additional files intended for author
As explained in the previous section, you can upload additional files for the author. You can find detailed instructions on how to do in the Editors Manual, section 3.3.2.

7.3.6 How to change a revision deadline
Revision deadlines can be updated in multiple locations on a case-by-case basis:

- On the decision page, right underneath the overview grid of reviews and decisions submitted to date:

- On the ‘Notify Author’ page, at the top (only in case of a revise decision!):

- On the Details page:
Changing the deadline via the decision page, notify author page, or via Details before you have sent the decision letter to the author will result in the system automatically communicating the updated date to the author in the decision letter when eventually sent out. After the decision letter has been sent, you can still update the revision deadline through Details (see second screenshot under the Details bullet above), but the system will not automatically communicate the new deadline to the author via email, though the new deadline is shown in the author's menu and is also the one that is used if you were to send out revision reminders.

Should you wish to update the default revision deadlines, this is possible as well and can be done per article type. To have such changes implemented, please contact EM Support.

7.4 How to cancel/replace decisions / final disposition
In general, if you have taken a formal decision using Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments, you can use Rescind Decision to cancel your decision and move the paper back to your menu for further action. When ready, you can simply put in a new decision (using Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments) which will replace the previous one. However, there are two exceptions to this rule:

1. If the final disposition has been set to ‘accept’ (ms is in All Submissions with Final Disposition -> Accept subfolder): there is no way to undo this; if further changes are needed at this stage (which should be rare), these need to be taken care of outside the system and you will need to contact your Desk Editor as soon as you can to discuss the best way to incorporate these changes (e.g., replace file with typesetter, incorporate changes via proof corrections, etc.).

2. If the final disposition has been set to ‘withdrawn’ (ms is in All Submissions with Final Disposition -> Withdrawn subfolder): As this option does not necessarily include your having taken a formal decision using Submit Editor’s Decision and Comments, you will also not be able to rescind the decision for these papers. There is an alternate option that is available for such withdrawn mss called Initiate Rebuttal. This, however, reopens the option for the author to submit a revised version online. It does not move the paper back to your menu for a decision, so if you would use this initiate rebuttal option, the next step would be for the author to submit a revision.
7.5 Final acceptance, copyediting & sending mss on to Brill

Copyediting comes before final acceptance in EM as the ‘Accept’ decision label means that the paper is fully ready for typesetting and transfer to Brill and that neither author nor editor/copy editor need to make further changes.

If the author still needs to make changes, submit a revise decision using Submit Editor's Decision and Comments. When the author submits the revise online, you can proceed as needed (arrange for copyediting where needed and when fully ready, accept and transfer to Brill).

If a paper still needs to be copyedited by you:

1. **Hold off on submitting your final accept decision.**

2. Use Send Email -> ‘AUTHOR: Ad Hoc Notification of Formal Acceptance’. This does not count as a formal decision in EM, but does allow you to inform the author that the paper is basically accepted, but still needs to be copyedited.

3. **Download the ms source files** via File Inventory and edit them on your computer as needed. As the paper will no longer be sent for review and reviewers lose access to the submission once they have submitted their review, you can prepare a complete non-anonymized file.

4. **Replace the files in EM** using Edit Submission. To avoid confusion, remove the original ms file uploaded by the author and upload your edited version as (anonymized) (Revised) Manuscript. For double blind journals, the system will still require a separate title page so it is best to leave the original title page in. For revisions, a ‘Response to Reviews’ is usually required as well, so you can leave that in, too. When ready, make sure to keep pressing the confirmatory (proceed/next/ok, etc.) options so that the system will create a new PDF for the submission and confirm the author's answer to the Open Access question. Then you will need to view and approve the new PDF version. [For more details on how to Edit Submission, see the Editors Manual, sections 3.1.6 & 3.1.6.2]

5. **Submit your accept decision** using Submit Editor's Decision and Comments, and notify the author as part of the decision process.

6. **Transfer the paper to Brill** by using Set Final Disposition and selecting the ‘Accept’ option. If you have any comments for the Desk Editor at Brill (e.g., which issue the paper should be published in), please make sure to add these into the 'Production Notes' box. Make sure to keep confirming until the system either gives you an option to go back to the folder you started out from or your main menu or returns you there automatically. [Full details on setting the final disposition can be found in the Editors Manual, section 3.3.3.3.]

If the paper still needs to be copyedited by a Copy Editor:

1. **Hold off on submitting your final accept decision.**

2. Use Send Email -> ‘AUTHOR: Ad Hoc Notification of Formal Acceptance’. This does not count as a formal decision in EM, but does allow you to inform the author that the paper is basically accepted, but still needs to be copyedited.

3. Use **Assign Editor** to send the ms to the Copy Editor.

4. The Copy Editor will download the files and insert the final ones into EM and when done, will submit a 'Copyediting Completed' decision which will be returned to you for final processing.

5. **Now you can accept the paper.** You will find the ms with the Copy Editor's decision with a 'Decision in Process' status either in Submissions with Required Reviews Complete (action to take: Submit Editor's Decision and Comments and notify the author as part of the decision process) OR in All Submissions with Editor's Decision (action to take: Notify Author).

6. **Transfer the paper to Brill** by using Set Final Disposition and selecting the ‘Accept’ option. If you have any comments for the Desk Editor at Brill (e.g., which issue the paper should be published in), please make sure to add these into the 'Production Notes' box. Make sure to keep confirming until the system either gives you an option to go back to the folder you started out from or your main menu or returns you there automatically. [Full details on setting the final disposition can be found in the Editors Manual, section 3.3.3.3.]

If the Copy Editor is not registered in EM as a separate editor, you can send them the ms files via Send Email -> 'COPY EDITOR: New Assignment,' in which case the Copy Editor will need to return the final files to you via email and you will need to insert these into the system. For this you can follow the steps as described above under 'If a paper still needs to be copyedited by you' [you can send the files to the Copy Editor at the same time as you take care of step 2]. If you
would like to have the Copy Editor set up in EM as an editor so that you can formally assign the papers to them for copyediting, please contact EM Support.

7.5.1 Where does copyediting fit into EM?
Copyediting comes before final acceptance in EM as the ‘Accept’ decision label means that the paper is fully ready for typesetting and transfer to Brill and that neither author nor editor/copy editor need to make further changes. For full details see above.

7.5.2 Copyediting still needed but ms already accepted
The action you need to take here depends on whether you have already set the final disposition to ‘Accept’:

1. **If the final disposition has been set to ‘Accept’**, there is no way to undo that (so if the ms is in All Submissions with Final Disposition -> Accept subfolder). In such cases, step 1 is to get in touch with your Desk Editor as soon as possible to let them know that the ms that was sent through was not final yet so that they can put the process on hold. This should be rare, of course, but we do realize that every once in a while something may go wrong and further changes are needed after you sent it through to Brill. Depending on the changes needed and the stage the ms is in, the solution may differ (e.g., if the typesetter has not started yet, they should be able to put the ms on hold and simply go ahead with the new file when supplied; if the changes are minor, it may be easier to just implement them as proof corrections, etc.). In cases where the final disposition was already set, you will need to send the copyedited version to the Desk Editor via email when ready.

   If already finalized in EM, you can no longer assign it to a Copy Editor via EM, but you can still use the Send Email option (‘COPY EDITOR: New Copyediting Assignment’; you will need to enter the email address and recipient’s name in the email text yourself). This email allows you to attach files either from your pc or straight from EM (submission files) and a copy of this email will be saved automatically into the correspondence archive that you find under History.

   To keep track of this, you can make an editorial note on the details page (‘ms notes’ text box about halfway through the page – tick the ‘display ms notes flag’ immediately above before saving your changes to activate the little red triangle that should serve as a reminder that you have notes stored for the ms). You can also make use of the submission flags that you can (de)activate by clicking on the flag symbol next to details (simply tick to activate/untick to deactivate and ‘submit’); when active, they will show next to details and can give you some information at a glance (e.g., ‘copyediting in progress’). We have some default flags available already, and EM Support can add more flags upon request.

2. **If the author has been notified and the ms is still in All Submissions with Editor's Decision** (status: Accept) or Submissions out for revision (status: Revise), however, you can rescind the accept decision. That would take the process one step back and simply cancel the decision you put in. Once rescinded, you can use assign editor to send the ms to the Copy Editor.

3. **If the author has not yet been notified and the ms is still in All Submissions with Editor's Decision** (status: Decision in process), you can use assign editor to send the ms to the Copy Editor.

7.5.3 Add copyeditor to workflow (new editorial role)
Please contact EM Support to have your Copy Editor set up in EM. For details on how the Copy Editor fits into the editorial workflow, see above.

7.5.4 Cannot set final disposition to Accept, only to withdrawn
If you are trying to set the final disposition to ‘Accept,’ and only find the option ‘withdrawn,’ you or another editor have likely missed a step. The ‘Accept’ final disposition option does not become available until the author decision letter has been sent via Submit Editor's Decision and Comments or via Notify Author. Once that has been done, the status will be shown as ‘Accept’ and you should be able to set the final disposition. For a detailed overview of the various manuscript statuses that you may come across in the system, see the Appendix I at the back of the Editors Manual.

Please note that the set final disposition option is intended to fully finalize a ms in EM: with the ‘accept’ option you can send the ms and related submission data on to Brill for typesetting; with ‘withdrawn’ you can deactivate it altogether (for instance, if an author wants to withdraw the submission, or it turns out that you have received the same
ms multiple times). Set Final Disposition is not a decision option; if you need to submit a decision, you need to use Submit Editor's Decision and Comments.

8. Main Menu
8.1 Cleaning up EM
8.1.1 Mss with active status have been processed outside of EM and need to be cleaned up
If in the past, some mss were processed outside EM and are now cluttering the system (and hence your overview), you can clean these up as follows:

If a paper is actually out for revision but shows up in the editor's menu as requiring action from that editor, please take a revise decision and make sure the author is notified (Submit Editor's Decision and Comments / Notify Author) – here as well you can edit the decision letter to let the author know that you are cleaning up the system and by sending the letter you are ensuring that they have the option to send the revision in online when ready. The paper should then get a 'Revise' status.

If already rejected, published, or already in the hands of the desk editor for quite a while, please use the Set Final Disposition action link and choose the 'Withdrawn' option. This will not trigger any system letters but will deactivate the submission so that the system does not expect anyone to take any further action on the paper. If you set the final disposition for a paper to 'withdrawn,' it is also advisable to add an editorial note explaining why you did this (e.g., ‘ms already published, set status to withdrawn in order to clean up EM’). Such editorial notes can be added via Details: about halfway down the details page, you will find a text box called ‘Manuscript Notes’ and you can insert your comments here; before saving your changes, make sure the ‘Display Manuscript Notes Flag’ check box immediately above is ticked and that you add your initials and date to your comment so that you can easily determine afterwards who added the comment and when. The check box will trigger the display of a little red triangle next to the details action link, which should serve as a visual reminder that you have editorial notes stored for the manuscript.

For very recent accepts, it is advisable to finalize the accept decision (Submit Editor's Decision and Comments / Notify Author) and set final disposition to ‘Accept.’ If necessary, you can always edit the decision letter to the author explaining that the letter needed to be sent to clean up the system. When setting the final disposition to ‘Accept,’ you will be led through the Transmittal Form and on there you find a box called ‘Production Notes’ – in that box you can add comments for the Desk Editor at Brill and in cases like these, could add a note that they can disregard the EM alert as the paper was already sent to them earlier via email.

Please note that using EM is something that not only affects you as editor, but also brings benefits to authors and we expect in the not-too-distant future also for reviewers, as well as the journal as a whole. Whereas in the past, EM was a standalone system and it may not have been a major problem if not fully used, EM is nowadays connected to several other systems and it is therefore increasingly important that the system is used properly and that accepted submissions are sent through to Brill via EM. To give you an impression of what these other system connections entail:

When you set the final disposition to ‘Accept,’ this a.o. triggers an automated transfer of all files and relevant manuscript data from EM to our typesetting system. This allows us to work more efficiently and reduce turnaround times on our end, so should speed up final publication and reduce unnecessary errors caused by manual insertion of data. When you set the final disposition to ‘Accept’ and the author indicated that they would like to have their article published in Open Access, this will also automatically trigger a payment request to the author through which they can process their payment, indicate which CC license should be used and make sure that any discounts they may be entitled to are applied to their invoice.

Due to this automated transfer, we will also be able to use any authenticated ORCID IDs supplied by authors and co-authors as well as any funding information supplied by the authors. ORCID is an independent, open source initiative that provides a unique personal identifier to a researcher to which they can connect all of their publications and other relevant information.

In addition, for journals that are working well within EM, we have recently set up an automated connection with Kudos, allowing authors to add a ‘Plain Language Summary’ during submission that will be sent over to Kudos fully
automatically as soon as you set the final disposition to ‘Accept’. Kudos is a tool that allows authors to easily promote and track their publications.

If you have any questions about the system whatsoever, please do not hesitate to reach out to EM Support. We are more than happy to help.

8.1.2 Cleaning up mss in Sent back to Author
In general, if you need to clean up a ms in EM, you can use the set final disposition option ‘withdrawn.’ This will deactivate the ms without sending any emails. However, for mss that have been sent back to author, this unfortunately does not work (this is the only exception to the rule). If you want to remove a ms from that folder because either the author has meanwhile resubmitted the ms as a new submission, or because you do not expect the paper to be resubmitted any more, you can clean up the system as follows by proxying for the author, look up the ms in their main menu and remove submission. If remove submission does not work, please contact EM Support for further assistance. If you need more information on how to proxy, please see the Editors Manual, section 2.2.2.

8.1.3 Folders incomplete/waiting for approval in my main menu: what does that mean?
If you find an Incomplete Submissions or Waiting for Approval folder in your main menu, you will need to take action on any papers in there: As long as a paper remains in these ‘waiting for approval’ or ‘incomplete’ folders, you may run into technical issues when trying to send the ms for review or when trying to submit a decision. Both ‘Incomplete’ and ‘Waiting for Approval’ statuses are related to your having pressed the Edit Submission action link, but not yet having fully finalized the process. Edit Submission allows you to make changes to the submission PDF that is available under View Submission as well as general submission data that you can see on page like the article title, type, authors, abstract, etc.

If you have made changes that you wish to retain:
1. If in Waiting for Approval, you can View Submission to check the newly created submission PDF and then Approve Submission to confirm that the new PDF version should be used going forward.
2. If in Incomplete Submissions, you can go back into Edit Submission mode to finish the process (go straight to 'Attach Files' and then keep confirming until the system is starting to build the PDF – for the Open Access question, you can simply confirm the author's original choice); when the new PDF is ready, you can view and approve this via the Waiting for Approval folder in your main menu.

If you simply want to resolve the issue and not retain any changes made, you can revert submission – that will simply reinstate the PDF version that was in the system at the time you pressed Edit Submission. If you only need to access the source files of the ms (e.g. MS Word version), you can download these via the File Inventory action link.

8.2 Cannot find ms in system
In principle, you should be able to find any submission in the system via the Search Submissions link at the top of your main menu. However, if you are trying to look for a ms and cannot find it in the system, this may have various causes aside from an obvious typo:

1. In the search menu, please double check the search ‘Criterion’ that is selected and whether that matches what you have entered as search ‘value.’
For instance, if the criterion is set to ‘Manuscript Number’ and you have entered an author’s last name, you will not get any results because the system is then searching for a number and not a name. If you want to search by author’s name, you can set the criterion to for instance ‘Corresponding Author Last Name.’

2. In the search menu, please click on Advanced Criteria (see also screenshot above). It may be that certain papers have been excluded from standard searches (e.g., exclude revisions). If that is the case, untick all boxes underneath ‘Advanced Criteria,’ tick ‘Save My Advanced Criteria’ at the top and press ‘Continue Building Search Criteria.’ After that, try a new search.

3. Be aware that if your search value includes words where you suspect special characters are potentially included in the ms information in EM, be aware that the system will only search for exact matches (so if you search for ‘Nuñez’ it will only show results for ‘Nuñes’ and not for other variations of the ‘ñ’ like a regular ‘n.’ In case of doubt, search for the part without special characters or put a ‘%’ in the location where you suspect a special character (so search for ‘Nu’ or ‘Nu%ez’). Alternatively, search for the ms using a different search criterion and value (e.g., part of the article title instead of the author’s name).

4. Some editors only have access to manuscripts that have been specifically assigned to them, so if this applies to you and you are trying to look up a ms that was not assigned to you, that may be why you cannot find the ms. If you are unsure whether this may be the case, feel free to contact EM Support. If changes are needed to journal settings in terms of which editors can and which editors cannot view all submissions in the system, this can be requested via EM Support as well, but please note that changes like these need to be confirmed by the Editor(s)-in-Chief.

5. You may have been blinded on the submission, in which case you will not be able to find the submission at all. EM allows editors to be blinded so as to avoid them being able to follow the editorial process for their own authored papers. Blinding is usually done by the main editors of the journal. If you wish to double check whether you have been blinded on a submission, please contact the main editors of the journal or free to contact EM Support.

8.3 Better overview requested

In principle, your main menu should show you all the mss that are under your care and should flag when action is needed. The ‘Editor’s To Do List’ section at the top is personalized so shows you only the mss for which you are the Handling Editor. In addition, you may have the All Submissions with Editor’s Decision action folder available near the bottom of your main menu containing mss for which you still need to notify the author and/or set the final disposition to Accept in order to send them off to Brill for typesetting. The Send Reminder Letters link at the bottom of your main menu allows you to pull up reports showing late authors and reviewers and send reminders where needed.

Apart from the default menu folders, it is also possible to create quick search links showing you a list of specific mss (e.g., all submissions that have not yet been accepted/rejected/withdrawn and where action is needed from editors). If you would like to make use of this, please contact EM Support and let us know which information you would like to have included (and excluded) in your quick search(es) so that we can set this up for you.
8.4 What does status x mean?
Please check Appendix I at the end of the Editor's Manual. This contains a complete overview of the various statuses and what they mean.

8.5 The same ms pops up in multiple locations, why is that?
This is correct: a ms will pop up in any main menu folders of which the status applies, so for instance, if a ms is newly assigned to you, you will find it in New Assignments but if the article type is set to require 0 reviews by default, you will also see it in Submissions with all required reviews complete. You can take action on the ms from either folder. Be aware though, that if you have a folder in your main menu called View All Assigned Submissions that this is intended for tracking purposes only and is not intended as an action folder, so you may not be able to take all possible actions from that folder. To take action on a ms it is best to look it up via the appropriate action folder in your main menu (Editor's To Do List section at the top and All Submissions with Editor's Decisions at the bottom of your main menu) or via Search Submissions.

8.6 How can I keep track of groups of mss (e.g., for a specific Special Issue)?
If you intend to process a Special Issue via EM, we suggest to have a dedicated article type set up for this (contact EM Support to set this up). Such an article type would basically have the same options and deadlines as a regular article, but would have ‘Special Issue: [short title of the issue]’ as its name so when you see the article in EM you would see the name of the Special Issue listed as the Article Type, making it easier to distinguish between the Special Issue and regular material. For full details on processing Special Issues via EM, see also above.

To keep track of mss in groups, you can also use the Linked Submission Groups; this allows you to create groups of mss, e.g., for a specific issue. Once you have a group set up, you can view the group and check the status of all associated mss at a glance; for more information, see sections 3.1.12 and 3.15 in the Editor's Manual.

You may find the submission flags helpful here as well: you can turn these on and off per ms (and can search for mss that have a specific flag activated and create quick search links for these searches; see the Editor's Manual, section 3.1.3.1).

8.7 How do I track mss after acceptance?
The process in EM ends after acceptance and transfer to Brill so the process between final acceptance and final publication is not covered in there. However, if you would like to have a post-acceptance status overview in EM as well, we suggest to do this by use of the submission flags and quick searches based on specific flags. The submission flags are the flags that you can trigger for display next to the details action link of a ms (click on the little grey flag next to details to get access to the flag overview and then (un)tick to (de)activate and 'submit'). You can search for mss which have a specific flag activated via Search Submissions (use the search criterion ‘Submission Flag Name’) and, if desired, we can create quick searches on such flags for you as well.

As long as you then use the flags consistently (only display the ones that reflect the current status) and you have all your material processed via EM, the quick searches should provide you with a good overview. For instance, you’d then be able to easily pull up a list with all mss with ‘1st proof corrected’ status.

The post-acceptance submission flags are not available by default, but EM Support is happy to activate these for you upon request.