

## Manuscript Evaluation & Decision Policy

The *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Production and Consumption* employs a standardized **Decision Metric (1–10)** to ensure objective, transparent, and actionable feedback for all submitting authors. Every manuscript is evaluated based on its methodological rigor, theoretical contribution, and practical relevance to the AI lifecycle.

**Methodological Rigor:** Soundness of experimental design, data integrity, analytical techniques, and reproducibility.

**Theoretical Contribution:** Novelty, significance, and advancement of foundational knowledge or frameworks within AI.

**Practical Relevance:** Applicability and impact on real-world AI lifecycle stages—from development and deployment to monitoring and governance.

### The Peer Review Decision Scale

Decisions are categorized into four primary tiers based on the cumulative assessment of the editorial board and external reviewers.

Score Range	Decision	Description & Expectations
1 – 3	Reject	Manuscripts with fundamental flaws, including fatal methodological errors, ethical breaches (e.g., plagiarism), or lack of topical relevance. Scores of 3 indicate severe weaknesses that cannot be salvaged through revision.
4 – 7	Major Revision	The core thesis shows promise, but significant barriers to publication exist. This may require additional data collection, experimental restructuring, or a complete rewrite of theoretical frameworks.
8 – 8.5	Minor Revision	The paper is fundamentally sound. Revisions are limited to clarifying arguments, updating literature reviews, or refining technical explanations. No new data or structural changes are required.
9 – 10	Accept	9: Acceptance pending final editorial polish or formatting. 10: "Accept as is"—reserved for exceptional manuscripts meeting all criteria upon first submission.

### Process & Resubmission Guidelines

**Transparency:** Authors receive the anonymized reviewer reports alongside the decision letter and numeric score.

**Revision Timeline:** Invitations for Major or Minor revisions include a standard deadline (typically 90 and 30 days, respectively). Extensions may be requested in advance.

**Resubmission:** Revised manuscripts must be accompanied by a **detailed point-by-point response** to all reviewer comments, detailing all changes made in red ink. Failure to adequately address key critiques may result in a rejection of the resubmission. A tabular response sheet is preferable.

**Appeals:** Rejection decisions may be appealed only on the grounds of significant procedural error or demonstrable reviewer bias. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Editor-in-Chief within 14 days of the decision.

This policy is designed to support authors with clear benchmarks for success and to uphold the highest standards of scholarly publication in the field of AI