Dia-noesis Journal

Manuscript Evaluation Criteria

Reviewer guidance: Please evaluate the manuscript as a whole, considering its scholarly contribution, methodological soundness, clarity, structure, and adherence to research and publication ethics. The decision should reflect the scale and nature of the revisions required. Green decisions indicate that the manuscript is fundamentally publishable with no or limited changes; yellow decisions indicate that substantive revision is required; and red decisions indicate that the manuscript cannot be accepted in its current form. A recommendation for resubmission should be used when the work has sufficient merit to justify a substantially reconstructed manuscript, whereas rejection without the right of resubmission should be reserved for serious ethical, integrity, legal, or other fundamental concerns.

Decision	Criteria	Typical circumstances
Accept in present form	The manuscript is of sufficient scholarly quality, is methodologically sound, clearly written, and requires no substantive changes.	No corrections required, or only purely optional stylistic improvements.
Accept with minor revisions	The manuscript is fundamentally sound and suitable for publication. Revisions are limited to minor errors that do not affect the substance, interpretation, or structure of the article.	Typos, spelling, grammar, punctuation, formatting, referencing inconsistencies, or very minor wording changes.
Accept with moderate revisions	The manuscript has sufficient merit for publication, but substantive revisions are needed. The central argument, methodology, and conclusions remain essentially sound.	Clarification of arguments, additional explanation, reorganisation of sections, improvement of the literature review, correction of limited analytical issues, or strengthening of the discussion.
Accept with major revisions	The manuscript has significant scholarly merit but requires substantial revision before it can be considered publishable. Important methodological, analytical, theoretical, or structural problems must be addressed.	Important methodological errors, substantial weaknesses in analysis, major gaps in argumentation, restructuring of the manuscript, substantial rewriting of sections, or significant additional analysis.

Reject with possibility of resubmission	The manuscript contains potentially valuable or original material, but its current weaknesses are too substantial to be resolved through ordinary revision. A fundamentally reworked manuscript would need to be submitted as a new version for fresh evaluation.	Serious methodological or conceptual problems, pervasive structural weaknesses, insufficient analysis, or major problems with the research design that require the work to be substantially reconceived.
Reject with no right of resubmission	The manuscript is unsuitable for publication because of fundamental ethical, legal, integrity, or other non-remediable concerns.	Research misconduct, plagiarism, extensive use of AI language, fabrication or falsification of data, serious breaches of research ethics, or other serious violations of the journal's ethical standards.

Key distinction between revision categories

Minor revision: Does not change the substance of the manuscript.

Moderate revision: Changes or strengthens parts of the manuscript, but the core study and conclusions remain intact.

Major revision: Requires substantial changes to methodology, analysis, argument, or structure, but the underlying study remains potentially publishable.

Resubmission after rejection: The manuscript cannot realistically be repaired through revision of the submitted version; the authors would need to substantially reconstruct the work and submit it anew.

Important: “Reject with no right of resubmission” should not be used simply because a manuscript is weak or poorly written. It should normally be reserved for serious ethical, research-integrity, legal, or other fundamental concerns that make resubmission inappropriate.