

## Editorial Policy

---

### SCOPE

The journal Nanofabrication (Nanofab) is devoted to the publication of research results related to all aspects of lithographic methods aiming at the submicron- to nanoscale, the exploitation and control of self-organization phenomena for patterning, and the application of the created structures and devices in physical, biomedical and life science experiments. The primary mission of the journal is to become the central publication venue for all members of the researcher community in the field of submicron- to nanoscale structuring and device fabrication. The journal is peer-reviewed, publishes in electronic-only format and on ongoing basis (no issues).

### MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts should be submitted to the journal via online submission system Editorial Manager, please check the bookmark Submission of Manuscripts. In case of problems, please contact the [Editorial Office](#) of this journal.

Manuscript submitted to this journal should:

- contain original work - not published elsewhere in any medium (in the whole or in part) by the authors or anyone else and not under consideration for publication in any other medium;
- focus on the aims and scope of the journal;
- be clearly and correctly written - should contain all essential features of a scientific publication that is easy to understand for the target audience;
- written in English - attention to detail of the language will avoid severe misunderstandings which might lead to rejection of the paper;
- be delivered in electronic format.

The journal publishes:

- Research Articles,
- Communications and Rapid Communications\*,
- Reviews and Mini-Reviews,
- Vision papers,
- Letter to the editor.

\*Rapid Communications should be intended to present new information of exceptional novelty and exciting results of significant interest to the readers. Authors are asked to provide an explanation in the cover letter why their contribution should be handled via rapid channel.

### FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS

Our contributors are asked to make sure their submissions comply with rules governing the formatting. Although the journal can provide limited technical support, it is ultimately the responsibility of the author to deliver a properly formatted electronic version of the article.

Please carefully follow the guidelines described in [Instructions for Authors](#).

### OVERVIEW OF THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

The whole peer-review workflow is performed in the Editorial Manager online system.

### SUBMISSION

Each manuscript should be accompanied by a cover letter which should explicitly state that the authors have the authority to publish the work and that the manuscript (or one with substantially the same content, by any of the authors) has not been previously published in any language anywhere and that it is not under simultaneous consideration by another journal. All authors of the manuscript are responsible for its content; they must have agreed to its publication and have given the corresponding author the authority to act on

their behalf in all matters pertaining to publication. The corresponding author is responsible for informing the coauthors of the manuscript status throughout the submission, review, and production process.

## PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Each manuscript after uploading to the Editorial Manager receives individual identification code that is used in any correspondence with regard to the publication process. However a submission may be declined by the Editor without review, if the studies reported are not sufficiently novel or important to merit publication in the journal. Manuscripts deemed unsuitable (insufficient originality or limited interest to the target audience) are returned to the author(s) without a review. The Journal Editor may appoint an Associate Editor with expertise in the relevant field, who is fully responsible for further handling the manuscript and an ultimate decision about its acceptance/rejection.

## CHOICE OF REVIEWERS

The Editor seeks advice from experts of in the appropriate field. Research articles and communications are refereed by a minimum of two reviewers, review papers by at least three.

## SUGGESTIONS FROM AUTHORS

Authors are requested to suggest persons competent to review their manuscript. However, please note that this will be treated only as a suggestion, the final selection of reviewers is exclusively the Editor's decision. The authors' names are revealed to the referees, but not vice versa.

The reviewers make an objective, impartial evaluation of scientific merits of the manuscript. Reviewers operate under guidelines set forth in [Guidelines for Reviewers](#) and are asked to comment on the following aspects of submitted manuscripts:

- novelty and originality of the work;
- broad interest to the community of researchers;
- significance to the field, potential impact of the work, conceptual or methodological advances described;
- study design and clarity;
- substantial evidence supporting claims and conclusions;
- rigorous methodology

If a manuscript is believed to not meet the standards of the journal or is otherwise lacking in scientific rigor or contains major deficiencies, the reviewers will attempt to provide constructive criticism to assist the authors in ultimately improving their work. If a manuscript is believed to be potentially acceptable for publication but needs to be improved, it is invited for reconsideration with the expectation that the authors will fully address the reviewer's suggestions.

Once all reviews have been received and considered by the Editor, a decision letter to the author is drafted. There are several types of decisions possible:

- Accept without revision
- Minor revision
- Major revision
- Reject

## REVISED MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

When revision of a manuscript is requested, authors should return the revised version of their manuscript as soon as possible. Prompt action may ensure fast publication if a paper is finally accepted for publication. If it is the first revision of an article, authors need to return their revised manuscript within 28 days. If it is the second revision authors need to return their revised manuscript within 14 days. If these deadlines are not met, and no specific arrangements for completion have been made with the Editor, the manuscript will be treated as a new one and will receive a new identification code along with a new registration date.

Final decision is made by the Journal Editor.

## FINAL PROOFREADING

Authors will receive a pdf file with the edited version of their manuscript for final proofreading. This is the last opportunity to view an article before its publication on the journal web site. No changes or modifications can

be introduced once it is published. Thus authors are requested to check their proof pages carefully against manuscript within 3 working days and prepare a separate document containing all changes that should be introduced. Authors are sometimes asked to provide additional comments and explanations in response to remarks and queries from the language or technical editors.

## IMMEDIATE PUBLICATION

Manuscripts ready for publication are promptly posted online. The manuscripts are considered to be ready for publication when the final proofreading has been performed by authors, and all concerns have been resolved. Authors should notice that no changes can be made to the articles after online publication.

## REPRINTS

Because the journal is published in Open Access model, and has no printed version, the authors receive no reprints.

## ERRATUM

If any errors are detected in the published material, they should be reported to the Journal Editor. The corresponding authors should send appropriate corrected material to the Editor via email. This material will be considered for publication as soon as feasible.

## COPYRIGHT

All authors retain copyright, unless – due to their local circumstances – their work is not copyrighted. The non-commercial use of each article will be governed by the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license. The corresponding author grants De Gruyter Open the exclusive license to commercial use of the article, by signing the [License to Publish](#). Scanned copy of license should be submitted via Editorial Manager along with the manuscript and covering letter. In case of any problems please contact Journal Editor by [email](#).

## SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT AND OTHER FRAUD

Scientific misconduct is defined by the Office of Research Integrity as "fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research". In cases where there is a suspicion or allegation of scientific misconduct or fraudulent research in manuscripts submitted or published, the Editors reserve the right to impose sanctions on the authors, such as:

- an immediate rejection of the manuscript;
- banning author(s) from submitting manuscripts to the journal for a certain period of time;
- retracting the manuscript;
- alerting editors of other journals and publishers;
- bringing the concerns to the authors' sponsoring or funding institution or other appropriate authority for investigation

This journal publishes only original manuscripts that are not also published or going to be published elsewhere. Multiple submissions/publications, or redundant publications (re-packaging in different words of data already published by the same authors) will be rejected. If they are detected only after publication, the journal reserves the right to publish a Retraction Note.

## RETRACTION POLICY

Serious errors in a published manuscript and infringements of professional ethical codes will result in an article being retracted. This will occur where the article is clearly defamatory, or infringes others' legal rights, or where the article is, or there is good reason to expect it will be, the subject of a court order, or where the article, if acted upon, might pose a serious health risk. In any of these cases all coauthors will be informed about a retraction. A Retraction Note detailing the reason for retraction will be linked to the original article.

## CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

In order to encourage transparency without impeding publication, all authors, referees and editors must declare any association that poses a conflict of interest in connection with the manuscript. There should be

no contractual relations or proprietary considerations that would affect the publication of information contained in a submitted manuscript. A competing interest for a scholarly journal is anything that interferes with, or could reasonably be perceived as interfering with, the full and objective presentation, review, or publication of research findings, or of articles that comment on or review research findings. Potential conflicts of interest exist when an author, editor or reviewer has financial, personal or professional interests in a publication that might influence their scientific judgment.

Examples of such conflicts include, but are not limited to:

- Financial conflicts: stock ownership; patents; paid employment or consultancy; board membership; research grants; travel grants and honoraria for speaking or participation at meetings; gifts,
- Personal conflicts: relationship with editors, editorial board members, or with possible reviewers who have had recent or ongoing collaborations with the authors, have commented on drafts of the manuscript, are in direct competition, have a history of dispute with the authors,
- Professional conflicts: public associations with institutions or corporations whose products or services are related to the subject matter of the article; membership of a government advisory council/committee; relationship with organizations and funding bodies.

Authors should declare whether they have any conflicts of interests that could have influenced the reporting of the experimental data or conclusions in their paper. Such a statement should list all potential interests or, if appropriate, should clearly state that there are none. The editors may decide not to publish papers when we believe the competing interests are such that they may have compromised the work or the analyses or interpretations presented. Upon submission of a manuscript, authors may suggest to exclude any specific editors or reviewers from the peer review of their article. It is the responsibility of authors to disclose in the Acknowledgments section any funding sources for the project or other relationships that are relevant.

Editors should consider whether any of the above competing interests are relevant to them and the manuscript under consideration. Editor who believes that the conflict will preclude an impaired judgment should disclose to the Editor the nature of the conflict and decline to handle the paper.

Reviewers should consider whether any of the above applies to them and declare any such competing interests. If they feel they cannot review a paper because of any competing interest, they should tell us. They should also declare any association with the authors of a paper.