


MPCE Guidelines for Paper Reviewers

14 Weeks from submission to publication

CODEN JMPSGE ISSN 2196-5625(Print); ISSN 2196-5420(Online) CN 32-1884/TK



Guidelines on High-quality Papers

- **Significance:** The specific problems/issues presented in the paper should be meaningful, timely, and of practical value and have some technical significance to deserve investigation; They should at least be useful to some audience (or to say they should not be a problem that only the author team faces and no one else would benefit for reading this paper).
- **Originality:** The paper should contain original contributions that are innovative and have a potential impact on academic research, industry application, or both. Originality will be made evident in the early parts of the paper, and the case is made by citing literature to describe the state-of-the-art and highlight the research gap (make sure the most of the related works are included in the list of references whereas excessive self-citations are discouraged), for example, and the introduction and aims and objectives will reflect this fact as well, as in the discussion of results and conclusions; For application papers, the importance, uniqueness and relevance of the problem addressed and the usefulness of the contribution for the practicing community is of great importance. It is also recommended to validate the techniques using data provided by the industry for such type of paper.
- **Rigor:** The research work conducted to support, validate, or demonstrate the paper's contribution shall have a certain degree of technical depth and scientific rigorousness. In other words, rigor should be evident from the meat of the paper – strong and extensive (i.e., substantial) datasets rigorously analyzed, and where relevant, marrying experimental, analytical and numerical work.
- **Effective Presentation:** The paper's texts and illustrations shall be able to communicate the contents effectively, the paper should be well structured, and the MPCE Journal Template should be followed for the formatting (available at: http://www.mpce.info/ch/reader/view_news.aspx?id=20150519040134001). Quality of the English language is important, and this is to be carefully checked before the submission (American and British English are acceptable, but the mix of the two should be avoided). To promote equal opportunities, inclusive language is strongly recommended (the content should be free of any

wording that could be understood as offensive on the grounds of race, gender, age, disability, health conditions, ethnicity, culture, and sexual orientation). Concurrent submissions to different journals are not allowed.

Review Principles

Recognition of reviewers

- The success of the journal depends on reviewers' efforts and timely completion of review tasks, and top reviewers will be recognized, with an Outstanding Reviewer Certificate, by the Journal annually;
- Outstanding reviewers are selected based on the recommendation of the AEs based on their exceptional review work. The selection criteria used by editors include:
 - (i) Overall quality of the review comments provided by the reviewer;
 - (ii) Number of papers reviewed by the reviewer overall for the journal
 - (iii) Number of paper reviews in the year of the award.

Accepting/Rejecting to be a reviewer

- If a paper assigned to you is outside your expertise or you have not published journal grade papers, please do not feel that you are obligated to review it. In fact, we recommend you decline such a review request. This approach is much better than providing an ill-informed review since the editor could be misled by the comments and make an inappropriate recommendation on the paper.
- We appreciate you letting the editor know immediately and encourage you to suggest alternative reviewers. This will enable the editor to find a new reviewer in a timely manner. It is totally acceptable to refuse a review request. It is unfair to the peer review process if you don't let the editor know your intention not to review.
- The principle of suggesting revise and resubmit or not is whether the paper can meet the criterion of high-quality papers after revision.

Reviewing time scale

The objective of this journal is to publish high-quality papers within 14 Weeks from submission.

- The 1st round reviews for the majority of the papers should be returned within a 4-week time frame.
- For the 1st round reviews, reviewers can have 4 options:
 - (a) Acceptance.
 - (b) Minor revision: A minor revision should be completed within 21 days.
 - (c) Major revision: A major revision, should be completed within 45 days.
 - (d) Reject and re-submission: resubmission is allowed except that further substantial work is included and should be completed within 90 days as a new paper.
- The 2nd round reviews for the majority of the papers should be returned within a 4-week time frame.



- For the 2nd round reviews, reviewers can have 3 options:
 - (a) Acceptance.
 - (b) Minor revision: A minor revision should be completed within 21 days.
 - (c) Rejection.

Length of Papers

The length limitations of papers are 12 pages (for Review and Views) and 10 pages (for Original Paper and Discussion).

Paper Template

Paper template: http://www.mpce.info/ch/reader/view_news.aspx?id=20150519040134001

Meet the Editor-in-Chief Team

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Yusheng XUE

NARI Group Corporation (State Grid Electric Power Research Institute), China

xueyusheng_MPCE@sgepri.sgcc.com.cn

Senior Editorial Advisor

Prof. Bikash PAL

Imperial College London, UK

mpce-bikash@sgepri.sgcc.com.cn

Vice Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Chi Yung CHUNG

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China

Vice Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Antonio GOMEZ-EXPOSITO

University of Sevilla, Spain

MPCE Task Force on Guideline

The Guidelines were developed by the MPCE Task Force between January and July 2022. The members of the MPCE Task Force for Guidelines for Editors, Reviewers, and Authors are:

Rabih Jabr, American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Xiao-Ping Zhang (Chair), University of Birmingham, UK

Junbo Zhao, University of Connecticut, USA



Bikash Pal (Advisor), Imperial College London, UK

Mevludin Glavic, Independent Researcher/Consultant, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Linquan Bai, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, USA

Ning Zhang, Tsinghua University, China

