

Effective: July, 2026

Version 1.0

IJUDA - Peer Review Process

The **International Journal of Underwater Domain Awareness (IJUDA)** is committed to ensuring the highest standards of academic excellence and scientific integrity. To achieve this, all research articles, reviews, and technical contributions are subjected to a rigorous and impartial evaluation process.

1. Initial Editorial Screening

Upon submission, all manuscripts undergo a preliminary evaluation by the Editorial Office. This initial stage assesses whether the manuscript falls directly within the scope of underwater domain awareness (UDA), adheres to the journal's formatting and submission guidelines, and successfully passes the mandatory plagiarism screening. Manuscripts that lack a clear, substantial connection to UDA or fail to meet the journal's baseline academic standards may be declined at this stage without being sent for external review.

2. Double-Blind Peer Review Framework

To ensure an objective evaluation and minimize implicit bias, IJUDA employs a strict double-blind peer-review model. Under this framework, the identities of the authors are entirely concealed from the reviewers, and the identities of the reviewers are kept strictly confidential from the authors throughout the entire review lifecycle.

Manuscripts that pass the initial editorial screening are assigned to a minimum of two independent, external subject-matter experts selected for their academic credentials and expertise in the relevant field.

3. Criteria for Evaluation

Reviewers are tasked with providing constructive, evidence-based feedback. Submissions are evaluated comprehensively against the following core criteria:

- **Relevance and Scope:** The explicit connection and significance of the research to the multidisciplinary field of underwater domain awareness.
- **Originality and Innovation:** The novelty of the work and its tangible contribution to the existing body of knowledge, technology, or maritime policy.
- **Methodological Rigour:** The soundness, reliability, and scientific validity of the research design, data collection, and analytical methods.
- **Validity of Conclusions:** The degree to which the findings and conclusions are directly supported by the presented data and results.
- **Clarity and Presentation:** The logical structure of the manuscript, the quality of the written English, and the accurate use of citations, tables, and figures.

4. Review Timelines and Editorial Decisions

The Editorial Office endeavors to facilitate a timely and efficient review process, generally aiming to complete the initial round of peer review within 1 to 2 months of submission.

Following the completion of the peer review, the handling editor will synthesize the reviewers' feedback and issue one of the following formal decisions:

- **Accept:** The manuscript is accepted for publication in its current form.
- **Minor Revision:** The manuscript requires slight modifications, formatting adjustments, or minor clarifications before final acceptance.
- **Major Revision:** The manuscript requires substantial restructuring, additional data analysis, or significant rewriting. (Note: A decision of Major Revision does not guarantee eventual acceptance; revised manuscripts will typically undergo a second round of review).
- **Reject:** The manuscript is fundamentally flawed, lacks originality, fails to meet the required academic standards, or falls outside the journal's scope.

The final authority regarding the acceptance or rejection of any manuscript rests exclusively with the Editor-in-Chief.

**Approved by,
Editorial Governance Board,
IJUDA**