

Chemical Society Reviews

Guidelines for Authors†

Also see: www.rsc.org/authorguidelines

CONTENTS

1.0 General policy

2.0 Article types

2.1 Tutorial Reviews

2.2 Critical Reviews

3.0 Submission

3.1 Initial submission

3.2 Submission of revised articles and material for proof preparation

4.0 Administration

1.0 General policy

Chemical Society Reviews publishes accessible, succinct and reader-friendly articles on topics of current interest in the chemical sciences. The promotion of international and multidisciplinary awareness and co-operation is particularly encouraged.

2.0 Article types

2.1 Tutorial Reviews

Tutorial reviews should be written to be of relevance both to the general research chemist who is new to the field, as well as the expert, and must be accessible to advanced undergraduates and beyond. They should provide an essential introduction to the field, serving as a springboard to further reading, and should have particular appeal to younger researchers seeking new fields to explore. Authors are required to write succinctly and select references carefully in order to give an enticing flavour of the topic rather than a comprehensive treatise. The implications of recent developments for the wider scientific community should be emphasised. Tutorial Reviews must be:

- **Short:** 10–12 000 word equivalents: the entire manuscript (double-spaced text and artwork) should not exceed 30–35 pages of A4 or American Quarto (10–12 journal pages).
- **Lightly referenced:** A maximum of 50–60 citations is strongly recommended. Multiple referencing (the use of a, b, etc.) is strongly discouraged.

- **Jargon free:** All specialist terms and symbols should be defined. Authors should not presume knowledge beyond undergraduate level. Fundamental ideas should be simply explained.

For most articles a broad outlook is required: authors should credit the major contributors within the citation limit. The 'and references therein' tag may be useful to direct the reader to further reading without having to list whole series of papers from one research group.

2.2 Critical Reviews

Critical Reviews should provide a deeper understanding of the topic in hand, yet retain their accessibility through an introduction written for the general reader. They should give a critical discussion of the existing state of knowledge of the subject matter, and while not exhaustive in coverage give a balanced assessment of the current primary literature, normally concentrating on the previous 5–10 years. The implications of recent developments for the wider scientific community should be emphasised and authors should aim to stimulate progress in the field. Critical Reviews must be:

- **Carefully referenced:** 250–300 citations are recommended. References should be selected to give a balanced view of the field but do not need to be exhaustive.
- **Jargon free:** All specialist terms and symbols should be defined. Fundamental ideas should be simply explained.

Articles should be of a suitable length to give an in depth discussion of the field but concise writing is encouraged and manuscripts should normally be between 20 and 30 journal pages in length (20–30 000 word equivalents, no more than 90 A4/American quarto pages in length (double-spaced text and artwork)). A good introduction is of prime importance and should include a historical perspective and set the topic for discussion in the context of current chemical research. The introduction must be accessible to the general chemist. The body of the review should provide an in-depth, critical (yet fair) discussion of the current field and aim to stimulate further research. A section of concluding remarks should include comment on applications or future prospects for the field.

3.0 Submission

3.1 Initial submission

Articles should be submitted using the RSC file upload service,

† For more detailed information on this topic, including guidelines for article layout, preparation of illustrations, presentation of experimental data, and supplementary information deposition, as well as links to useful websites, templates and other software resources, and authoring tools, see: <http://www.rsc.org/authorguidelines>.

ReSourCe.‡

Rapid publication is aided by careful preparation of text and illustrations. Particular attention is drawn to the use of (i) SI units and associated conventions, (ii) IUPAC nomenclature for compounds and (iii) standard methods of literature citation.

The RSC ReSourCe service allows any number of files to be uploaded. All files relating to a single manuscript should be uploaded simultaneously during one transaction. Files uploaded separately will result in more than one manuscript number being assigned and may subsequently be lost.

All authors submitting work for publication are required to agree a Licence to Publish. Authors submitting online will be asked to agree a Licence to Publish as part of the process. Alternatively, a downloadable PDF version is available,‡ which can be completed and forwarded to the Editorial Office. On submitting their manuscripts, authors are also encouraged to supply the names and addresses of 2–3 potential referees.

After submission your file will be acknowledged by the Editorial Office as soon as possible. Authors should contact the Editorial Office if they have not received an acknowledgement within 4 working days. Authors should not forward more than one version of their manuscript or submit the manuscript by post or e-mail to avoid errors in manuscript handling by the Editorial Office.

3.2 Submission of revised articles and material for proof preparation

Revised manuscripts should be sent to the Editorial Office by file upload *via* ReSourCe.‡

Please check the manuscript carefully for consistency, particularly in the representation of chemical formulae, compound names and words with alternative spellings.

Successful use of your electronic files should speed up the production process and avoid errors being introduced. Authors should ensure that files submitted at this stage contain the final version of their manuscript. Proof corrections should only correct errors from

the Production process and should not be used to make general changes to the text.

We will try to use the supplied data in our production process, but mathematical equations and tables in particular may be re-keyed by the typesetter. It is imperative that authors check their proofs (including any tabulated data and figures) very carefully. Papers are published as advance Articles on the web as soon as possible after the return of proof corrections. Late corrections cannot be incorporated after publication of the Advance Article.

4.0 Administration

The majority of reviews will be solicited by members of the Editorial Board in accordance with the policy of the Editorial Board. However, the Editorial Office welcomes suggestions for reviews that would be suitable for the journal.

To aid the Editorial Board judge the suitability of a proposed review for the journal, all authors should submit a synopsis. The aim is not to provide an extra burden for the author, but to ensure the article will appeal to the journal's intended readership and to reduce the overall time and work needed in the preparation of the final manuscript. **Acceptance of the synopsis by the Editorial Board does not guarantee publication of the final manuscript.** A synopsis pro-forma is available from the Editorial Office. The synopsis should include:

- A paragraph explaining the current importance of the field, its implications for the wider scientific community, and the communities of readers who will find the article of interest
- A structured synopsis of the review, giving section headings and expanding on each of these
- A few (8–10) sample references to indicate its breadth and timeliness
- A brief *curriculum vitae* of the leading author

Synopses should be returned to the Editorial Office in electronic form as a MS Word file (or a similar native format).

‡ See <http://www.rsc.org/resource>.