



# Guide for authors, reviewers and editors

The Managing Editorial Board of  
**Acarologia – Open Science in Acarology**

## 1 Principles

To develop transparency Acarologia presents here simultaneously author, reviewer and editor principles and guidelines, allowing and encouraging each actor of the chain of publication to know the expected contribution of all stakeholders.

### 1.1 Purpose

Acarologia, founded in 1959 by Marc André and François Grandjean, is the first and longest-publishing peer-reviewed journal devoted to Acarology.

Acarologia publishes results of original and high quality research on all aspects of Acarology, including molecular biology, taxonomy, physiology, ecology, evolution, behaviour, biogeography, genetics, morphology and physiology. Applied acarology, including economic studies, plant parasites and biological control, and veterinary aspects, are also accepted.

All groups within the Acari are considered.

The journal aims to promote research and spread knowledge of this important group of arthropods. Four issues are published every year.

The journal will publish research articles but other submissions are also welcome:

- research and technical notes,
- short notes,
- reviews,
- monographies,
- book reviews,
- letters and comments on prior papers in Acarologia.

### 1.2 Acarologia philosophy and open science

Acarologia publishes open access documents, assorted with Creative Common License. The copyright is held by the authors themselves. This point is important as many others journals, even non-profit ones publish “free access” articles under the name of “open access”, meaning that the journals hold the copyright. Acarologia open access is dedicated toward an open science

in Acarology. Our copyright policy allows a large, free and authors based diffusion, removing the traditional publisher copyright barrier. This policy allows the largest and quickest knowledge diffusion in Acarology, for the benefit of all of us. The leading team of Acarologia plays, surely a publisher role, but also and especially, a knowledge broker inside the scientific acarological community.

To facilitate this diffusion, Acarologia has also digitized and made publicly available with the same copyright notice all the previous issues of the journal since its foundation in 1959 by Marc André, a unique feature in the world of acarological science and publications.

### **1.3 Open access policy**

As stated above, Acarologia publishes articles by copyright-holder consent to exclusive right of first publishing and Open Access, meaning it does not require the abolition, reform, or infringement of copyright law. Nor does Acarologia require that copyright holders waive all the rights that run to them under copyright law and assign their work to the public domain.

By submitting texts to Acarologia, copyright holders consent to the unrestricted reading, downloading, copying, sharing, storing, printing, searching, linking, and crawling of the full-text of the work. These conditions authorize all the uses required by legitimate scholarship, including those required by the technologies that facilitate online scholarly research.

Acarologia assumes the most current CC-BY (Creative Commons) license, an easy, effective way for copyright holders to manifest their consent to Open Access. By submitting their work to Acarologia, authors accept the term of this copyright license.

## 2 Author guidelines

### 2.1 How to submit a manuscript

Manuscripts are submitted via a web interface ([http://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/CBGP/acarologia\\_ojs/index.php/acarologia/about/submissions](http://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/CBGP/acarologia_ojs/index.php/acarologia/about/submissions)). Authors must provide a pdf and a plain text document (Microsoft Word, OpenOffice or rtf).

### 2.2 Submission preparation checklist

As part of the submission process, authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items, and submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to these guidelines.

- The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor).
- The submission file is in (OpenOffice or Microsoft Word), and in PDF document file format.
- Where available, URLs for the references have been provided.
- The text is single-spaced; uses a 12-point font; illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the Author Guidelines.
- If applies: authors are responsible for verifying whether collection permit is necessary in the country from which their specimens originate, and for timely acquisition of such a permit.
- If applies: DNA sequences must be deposited in a public database (e.g., Genbank) and accession numbers should be provided in the final version of the manuscript.
- If applies: types of new species or subspecies should be deposited in a responsible scientific institution, specified in the text.
- After acceptance authors will have to provide separate files for the text, tables and figures in the requested format.

### 2.3 Manuscripts considered

- Original research on all aspects of Acarology.
- Review articles.
- Short notes. Short notes should not contain more than 2000 words. Sections within short notes can be combined, for example one section comprising the Results and Discussion. Short notes must contain abstract and keywords.
- Book reviews. Authors are encouraged to submit reviews of fundamental interest books for Acarology. Book reviews should not contain more than 1000 words.
- Opinion. We also welcome opinion manuscripts. Opinions should not contain more than 2000 words.

### 2.4 Presentation of manuscripts

**We encourage the use of Markdown for submitting accepted manuscripts.**

Manuscripts should be typed using a normal font, double-spaced throughout. Italics (except for genus and species names) and underlining are not accepted. Lines and pages must be numbered. Normal manuscripts should not exceed 10,000 words but monographies could be published with a longer text.

Articles must be written in English. The standard of English must be high and non-native English speaking authors are encouraged to have their manuscript read by a native English speaker before submission. Acarologia editors have the right to decline the submission if they feel the paper is not readable.

Please spell check and proofread your manuscript and carefully, including a crosscheck of citations and references.

All titles, subtitles and headers, and personal names must be in lower case.

Headers. Please do not use direct formatting for the headers

Do not 'full width' justify your document, instead justify all text to the left-hand margin.

## **2.5 Structure of manuscripts**

Arrange the manuscript in the following sequence:

First page: Title, Author(s), Affiliations, Abstract, Keywords

Text pages: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results or Taxonomy, Discussion, Acknowledgements, References

Captions: Tables captions, Figures captions.

Tables and figures must be cited in the text: (Figure 1) (Figures 2 and 3), (Table 1)... Footnotes are not allowed, but framed text emphasising particular points or additions can be considered. Descriptions and diagnoses of taxa should be written using the common taxonomic description format.

The abstract should be concise and not exceed 400 words. Keywords should be separated by semicolons.

Metric (SI) units should be used throughout. The number of decimal points must be consistent and significant (e.g. 65-78  $\mu\text{m}$ , not 64.93-78.2  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Dates should be in the form 22 Jan. 1975 (not 22.1.75). Be economical with tables: data given in graphs rarely need to be repeated in tabular form.

Italics should only be used for genus and species names.

All publications cited in the text should be included in the reference section. Papers 'in press' can only be cited if they have been accepted for publication; do not cite manuscripts 'in preparation' or 'submitted'.

## **2.6 References**

We want authors spending their time doing science, not formatting. But, we also want editors and Acarologia technical team spending their time making scientifically and aesthetically sounding publications, not normalising the references list. So authors are the only responsible of the list layout, but they should also be forgiven for their mistakes.

References are to be set-up using the following format:

- Journal article:

Kreiter S., Tixier M.-S. 1900. A nice publication. *Acarologia*, 1: 3-15.

Kreiter S., Tixier M.-S. 1900 . A publication. *Exp. Appl. Acarol.*, 1: 3-15.

- Electronic article :

Migeon A., Auger P., Navajas M. 2000 . Another nice publication. *Periodical Title* [Internet]. 99(99): 3-12. Available from: <http://www1/montpellier.inra.fr/CBGP/acarologia>

- Book:

Bertrand M. 2025. An encyclopedia of acarology. Montpellier: Publisher. pp. 1224.

- Electronic book:

Vial L. 2025. Ticks of the world [Internet]. Publisher. Available from: <http://www1/montpellier.inra.fr/CBGP/acarologia>

- Book section - Edited book

McCoy K.D. 2025. Birds ticks. In: Kreiter S., McCoy K.D. (Eds). *Birds of the world*. Montpellier: Publisher. p. 600-700.

- Thesis:

Roy L. 2010. *Ecologie évolutive d'un genre d'acariens hématophages* [Phd Thesis]. Lyon: Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire. pp. 297.

- Conference Proceedings:

Migeon A., Dorkeld F. 2008. Spider Mites Web a comprehensive database. In: Bertrand M., Kreiter K., McCoy K.D. (Eds). *Integrative acarology*; Montpellier: Euraac. p. 208-215.

- Report:

Denmark H.A. 1973. *Tetranychus evansi* Baker and Pritchard in Florida. Miami: Florida Department of Agriculture. Division of Plant Industry. No. 99.

- Electronic source:

Migeon A., Dorkeld F.. Spider Mites Web: a comprehensive database for the Tetranychidae [Internet]. [15 June 2009]. Montpellier: INRA/CBGP; [25 Sept 2009]. Available from: <http://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/CBGP/spmweb/>

We prefer manuscript references constructed using Zotero, Mendeley or Endnote. The Endnote and Zotero/Mendeley style templates can be downloaded from our web page. Please remove field codes before sending the manuscript.

## 2.7 Taxonomy, collection permit, geographic names and DNA sequences

All papers with a taxonomic content must follow the provisions of the latest edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Types of new species or subspecies should be deposited in a responsible scientific institution, specified in the text. The first mention of a species or genus-group name should include the full citation with the author (e.g. *Opilioacarus segmentatus* With, 1903), and abbreviated thereafter (e.g. *O. segmentatus*). Authorities for taxon names should only be cited in the references if they are listed in a synonymy.

Authors are responsible for verifying whether collection permit is necessary in the country from which their specimens originate, and for timely acquisition of such a permit.

DNA sequences must be deposited in a public database (e.g., Genbank) and accession numbers should be provided in the final version of the manuscript.

The strict policy of *Acarologia* is to stay neutral to any political or territorial dispute. Authors should depoliticize their studies by avoiding provoking remarks, disputable geopolitical

statements and controversial map designations. In case that this is unavoidable, the journal reserves the right to mark such at least as disputable at or after publication, to publish editor's notes or to reject/retract the papers.

## **2.8 Tables and figures**

Please refer to figure cheat sheet for full information.

Table files must be typed separately using spreadsheet software like Microsoft Excel or OpenOffice and should be ready for printing. Use Times Roman fonts. Use only top, column title and bottom lines as table borders.

Colour illustrations will be published online. The paper edition will be in black and white only.

Illustrations must be ready for printing. We encourage the use of svg files for drawings and figures. Otherwise electronic drawings and scanned figures should be in tiff format with LZW compression or png with high quality and must have at least a 600 dpi resolution according to final size (max width 18.5 cm).

Photos should be in jpg or png formats with low or no compression and must have a 300 dpi resolution. Inadequate artwork will not be accepted.

All figures (including photographs and maps) must be labelled in successive order, using Arabic numerals. Figures files must be named Figure1, 2 ... Sub-figures should be labelled (a), (b), etc. Magnifications should be indicated by scale bars on figures. Please use lower resolutions (300 and 150 dpi) and jpeg compression (80%) for manuscript submission.

Authors must pay attention to the quality of their art work. Taxonomical illustrations are of first importance and low or mid quality figures are not acceptable. Quality is a shared concern, not only the publisher's one.

## **2.9 Zoobank registration**

New taxa and articles dealing of taxonomy must be registered in Zoobank. Please refer to Zoobank cheat sheet for full information.

## **2.10 Page proofs**

One set of page proofs will be sent to the corresponding author and should be corrected and returned by e-mail. Excessive alterations will be charged to the authors.

## **2.11 Privacy statement**

The names and email addresses entered in this journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party.

## 3 Reviewer guideline

### 3.1 Principles

This guide is mostly about the principles for reviewers to use when called upon to assist us in maintaining high scientific standards for Acarologia. Our primary emphasis is to help our reviewers to understand how to approach reviews for Acarologia.

Long-time traditions make anonymous reviews in life sciences. We think that this time is now revolved and we encourage reviewers to remove anonymity. We should also consider the publication of high quality reviewer works as a main part of the scientific publication. It is our belief that a journal is medium for scientific communication, and part of communication of scientific ideas is the open acceptance of the possibility for reasonable disputes about various aspects of the work.

The decision about publication is entirely the Editor's responsibility. In most cases, the Editor will follow the will of the majority of the reviewers, but in some cases, that might not happen. In such cases, the Editor will be expected to provide substantive reasons for not accepting the recommendations of the majority of reviewers.

### 3.2 Reviewer guidelines

First and foremost, the goal of the review process is to improve the scientific quality of the submission. Reviewers will work with the author through a collaborative process to ensure scientific integrity. Constructive criticism is a necessary part of this collaborative effort and as such shall be offered and received in a professional manner. Authors and reviewers are reminded that both reviews and responses can become part of the open access public record associated with each manuscript.

The Editor's role includes that of being a moderator, in a literal way, of the discourse between reviewers and authors, and will enforce ethical standards of behaviour in the review and response process.

A statement ensures that reviewer declare no competing interest.

#### 3.2.1 Manuscript rating

In addition to textual comments and recommendations reviewers are asked to rate several aspects of the manuscripts submitted.

Originality: Poor/Average/Very good/Outstanding

Scientific quality: Poor/Average/Very good/Outstanding

Focus, brevity: Poor/Average/Very good/Outstanding

Adequacy of title/abstract to main text: Poor/Average/Very good/Outstanding

Style/English: Poor/Average/Very good/Outstanding

And the last: In its present form, this manuscript requires: Only routine editing in the editorial office/Minor revisions/Major revisions/Rejection but encourage resubmission/Rejection

### **3.3 Expected review content**

#### **3.3.1 Scientific content**

Although there can be no simple formula for what is acceptable scientific content, there are some basic principles that generally apply. The standards for a manuscript depend somewhat on the category of submission, but there are some general guidelines, i.e. references in support of an assertion, speculation, significance of the results and reproducibility. Taxonomical papers must also focus on originality and comparison with existing works. Reviewers are also encouraged to pay attention to the dispersion of knowledge encouraged by some institutions which focus on number of publications and impact factor rather than on smart diffusion of scientific progress.

#### **3.3.2 Quality of presentation**

There is no simple formula to follow for a successful presentation. The Editorial Board is quite agreeable to accepting a variety of stylistic choices, permitting authors to express themselves in their own unique way. But:

- Quality of figures is an important issue especially regarding taxonomical works but not only. Reviewers should pay close attention to the figures.
- Organization. The quality of presentation includes the issue of how the paper is organized. To some extent, the organization of the content is a style issue and the author should be allowed to do whatever she/he wishes, provided the resulting content can be followed reasonably easily. However, it is appropriate for a reviewer to make recommendations for reorganizing a paper's content in an effort to improve the presentation.

## 4 Editors

### 4.1 Principles

Accepting a position as an Editor carries with it great opportunity, and great responsibility. Every one of us is proud to participate to the elaboration of such a journal but is also aware of her/his responsibilities. Editors have the opportunity to exercise considerable control over what does and does not appear in the journal. This means that the Editor also has the responsibility to make decisions as impartially as is humanly possible.

As a first step to open review process toward an open science, Editors are credited on the publications.

### 4.2 Roles

Editors represent a transmission belt between authors and reviewers. They have the responsibility to choose the reviewers, to control the high quality standard of the publication and to take the final decision. This decision is always made on behalf of the entire Managing Board of the journal.

Editors choose reviewers in the Editorial Board list but not only. They can be assisted by the authors who are encouraged to provide a list of potential reviewers, in regard of their competence and absence of conflict of interest. The final choice only depends of the Editor and must be an informed choice.

Acarologia maintains an index of potential reviewers containing relevant specialities in order to streamline the reviewing process.

### 4.3 Conflict of interest

Editors have the responsibility to decline a submission if they have or could have a conflict of interest with the author. Editors are responsible for avoiding even the appearance of impropriety in carrying out their duties.