



From Manuscript to Published Paper: Understanding the Editorial Journey at Koozakar

Victor Sobanke^{1*}, Aishat Funmilayo Abdulraheem², Morufu Olalekan Raimi³, Augustine Ayodeji Omoyajowo⁴, and Rebecca Alao⁵

¹National Centre for Technology Management, Victoria Island, Nigeria

²Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Uyo, Nigeria

³Niger-Delta Institute for Emerging and Re-Emerging Infectious Diseases (NDIERID), Federal University Otuoke, Nigeria

⁴Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, Federal University Oye-Ekiti

⁵University of Ibadan, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author

Email: v_sobanke@hotmail.com

Article Information

<https://doi.org/10.69798/10799952>

ISSN: 3069-1710

Copyright ©: 2026 The Author(s).

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY-4.0) License, which permits the user to copy, distribute, and transmit the work provided that the original authors and source are credited.

Published by: Koozakar LLC. Atlanta GA 30350, United States.

Note: The views expressed in this article are exclusively those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions of their affiliated organizations, the publisher, the editors, or the reviewers. Any products discussed or claims made by their manufacturers are not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Guest Editors:

Dr. Abiodun Egbetokun^{id}

Dr. Oluseye Oludoye^{id}

Abstract

This policy brief maps the core stages of Koozakar's editorial workflow and interprets them against a small set of verified publishing standards and empirical studies. The brief has been rewritten to remove unsupported precision, align claims more closely with available evidence, and distinguish clearly between Koozakar operational observations and general sector guidance. The analysis identifies four priorities for workflow quality: transparent editorial triage, structured peer review, disciplined revision handling, and strong metadata practices. It also argues that open and equitable fee policies, reviewer support, and cautious use of automation can strengthen trust without sacrificing rigor. Rather than presenting unverified performance metrics as settled findings, the brief offers a policy-oriented framework that Koozakar can use to communicate its publishing process more credibly and improve it incrementally.

Keywords: Editorial workflow; Scholarly publishing; Peer review; Transparency; Metadata; Open access; Research integrity; Koozakar

INTRODUCTION

Scholarly publishing is a staged process through which manuscripts are screened, reviewed, revised, prepared for publication, and then disseminated into the scholarly record. Across this process, journals are increasingly expected to be transparent about editorial criteria, peer-review practice, publication ethics, and post-acceptance handling ([International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \[ICMJE\], 2026](#)). For a publisher such as Koozakar, explaining this workflow clearly is not only an administrative exercise; it is part of building trust with authors, reviewers, and readers. This policy brief explains the journey from submission to publication at Koozakar and situates that workflow within broader discussions on quality, timeliness, discoverability, and equity in scholarly communication. The revised version deliberately avoids unsupported quantitative claims. Instead, it presents a defensible synthesis of internal workflow practice and selected external guidance. The result is a practical brief that can support author education, editorial consistency, and future process improvement.

Objectives

- Map the main stages of the manuscript lifecycle at Koozakar, from submission to publication.
- Identify common failure points that slow progression or lead to desk rejection.
- Propose policy actions that can improve transparency, consistency, discoverability, and equity.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

This brief uses an evidence-informed interpretive approach rather than a formal performance audit. Three inputs informed the analysis: internal Koozakar workflow materials and author-facing guidance; editorial observations about recurring submission and revision issues; and a focused set of external sources on peer review, editorial transparency, metadata, and responsible scholarly publishing ([Crossref, 2024](#)).

Because the underlying manuscript did not provide an auditable dataset for the numerical claims initially reported, those claims have been removed, softened, or recast as policy targets instead of empirical findings. This revision therefore aims at

credibility and usability: it keeps what can be defended, drops what cannot yet be demonstrated, and points toward future internal monitoring should Koozakar wish to publish verified operational metrics later.

DISCUSSION

Submission and editorial triage

The submission stage is the first decisive gate in the publication pathway. At this point, editorial staff assess basic fit with journal scope, adherence to formatting requirements, ethical completeness, and the overall readiness of the manuscript for external review. International publishing guidance supports early clarity about aims, scope, journal policies, and author responsibilities because these reduce avoidable friction and prevent weak submissions from moving inefficiently into later stages ([ICMJE, 2026](#)).

Editorial responsibility begins after administrative compliance has been satisfied. At that stage, the editor must determine whether a submission fits the journal's aims and scope, offers a credible scholarly contribution, and meets baseline standards of conceptual and methodological soundness. Timely desk decisions are therefore not merely a speed mechanism; they are part of responsible quality control that protects reviewer time and gives authors an early, clear signal when a manuscript is misaligned or underdeveloped ([Egbetokun, 2026](#)). For Koozakar, the main policy implication is straightforward: desk triage works best when the journal communicates expectations in language that authors can act on before submission. A transparent triage process should not be understood merely as rejection management. It is also an author-support mechanism, because clear screening criteria help serious submissions reach review more efficiently and reduce preventable editorial back-and-forth.

Peer Review Quality and Timeliness

Peer review remains central to editorial quality control, but the literature also shows that review duration and reviewer experience vary widely across disciplines and journals ([Huisman & Smits, 2017](#)). Koozakar's use of blinded review, reviewer invitation, decision synthesis, and revision requests is broadly consistent with standard practice.

Table 1: Common Issues at the Submission Stage and Appropriate Corrective Action

Factor	Typical Issue	Why it Matters	Preferred Editorial or Author Response
Scope fit	Manuscript does not match the journal's focus	Poor fit leads to early triage difficulty	State scope clearly and ask authors to align title, abstract, and aims with the target journal
Formatting compliance	Structure, tables, references, or file preparation are inconsistent	Non-compliance slows technical checks	Provide a concise submission checklist and require clean, editable files
Ethics and declarations	Missing authorship, conflict, or originality statements	Incomplete declarations weaken trust	Make declarations mandatory before peer review
Scholarly readiness	Argument, language, or evidence is not yet sufficiently developed	Weak manuscripts are unlikely to benefit from external review	Issue constructive desk decisions that identify the main readiness gaps
Metadata quality	Weak title, abstract, or keywords	Poor metadata reduces discoverability later	Encourage authors to optimise descriptive metadata at submission

The policy challenge is not simply to move manuscripts quickly; it is to combine timeliness with fair, informed, and ethically grounded assessment.

COPE guidance emphasizes that journals should explain how peer review is managed and that reviewers should be supported with clear expectations about confidentiality, conflicts of interest, and the purpose of the review (COPE, n.d.). In practice, this means reviewer templates,

reminder systems, and decision letters that synthesize not merely forward review comments. These measures help protect consistency and improve the author experience even where turnaround times differ across journals.

Revision As a Structured Improvement Stage
Revision should be treated as a disciplined stage of scholarly improvement rather than a procedural afterthought.

Table 2: Revision-stage Decisions and the Documentation Expected from Authors

Factor	Typical Issue	Why it Matters	Preferred Editorial or Author Response
Scope fit	Manuscript does not match the journal's focus	Poor fit leads to early triage difficulty	State scope clearly and ask authors to align title, abstract, and aims with the target journal
Formatting compliance	Structure, tables, references, or file preparation are inconsistent	Non-compliance slows technical checks	Provide a concise submission checklist and require clean, editable files
Ethics and declarations	Missing authorship, conflict, or originality statements	Incomplete declarations weaken trust	Make declarations mandatory before peer review
Scholarly readiness	Argument, language, or evidence is not yet sufficiently developed	Weak manuscripts are unlikely to benefit from external review	Issue constructive desk decisions that identify the main readiness gaps
Metadata quality	Weak title, abstract, or keywords	Poor metadata reduces discoverability later	Encourage authors to optimise descriptive metadata at submission

Strong revision handling depends on clear editorial decisions, point-by-point author responses, and transparent identification of changes made to the manuscript. ICMJE recommendations support this emphasis on clarity, responsibility, and accurate reporting throughout the editorial process (ICMJE, 2026).

At Koozakar, a useful policy position is to insist on focused revision packages: a clean revised manuscript, a marked version where necessary, and a response document that addresses reviewer comments systematically. This approach improves editorial traceability and reduces the risk that authors respond selectively or ambiguously to major concerns. It also shortens the work required of editors and reviewers in subsequent rounds.

Production, Metadata, and Publication Readiness

After editorial acceptance, the quality of production and metadata becomes highly consequential. Publishing is not complete when a paper is accepted; it is complete when the article is accurately prepared, persistently identified, and readily discoverable. Crossref stresses that metadata do more than support search; they also carry signals of provenance, connection, and trust across scholarly systems (Crossref, 2024).

For Koozakar, this means that copyediting, author identifiers, DOI registration, structured abstracts, and keywords should be treated as core parts of publication quality. Metadata work is especially important for smaller or emerging publishers, because discoverability often depends less on brand recognition and more on the completeness and consistency of the underlying records. Better metadata do not guarantee citation impact, but they strengthen the conditions under which published work can be found, linked, and assessed.

Open access, APC transparency, and equity

Any discussion of workflow quality must also address who can participate in the publication system. Transparent article processing charge (APC) policies, waiver information, and journal ownership details are central elements of trustworthy open-access practice (DOAJ, n.d.). Koozakar therefore benefits from making fee arrangements, waivers, and journal policies easy to locate and easy to interpret.

Claims about a universal open-access citation advantage should be handled cautiously because the evidence is mixed and context dependent. However, open-access visibility and lower access barriers can still support dissemination goals, especially when combined with strong metadata and clear journal information (Langham-Putrow, Bakker, & Riegelman, 2021). For a policy brief, the defensible point is not that open access automatically produces superior impact, but that transparent and equitable access policies improve legitimacy and broaden opportunities for participation.

Reviewer Recognition and Careful Automation

Reviewer support matters because journals rely heavily on voluntary expert labor. Recognition systems can help document reviewer contribution, although they should not be oversold as a standalone solution to timeliness. ORCID provides infrastructure through which trusted organizations can add validated peer-review activity to an individual's record (ORCID, n.d.). For Koozakar, this is best understood as a complementary recognition tool rather than proof that review cycles will automatically become shorter.

The same caution applies to AI-assisted screening and editorial automation. The January 2026 ICMJE update includes new guidance on the use of artificial intelligence in publishing, underscoring the need for human accountability and careful governance (ICMJE, 2026). Automation may help with technical checks, plagiarism screening, or workflow routing, but it should be introduced incrementally and monitored for bias, accuracy, and editorial side effects.

Policy Implications for Koozakar

The revised evidence base supports a practical policy agenda for Koozakar. First, author-facing instructions should remain concise, visible, and actionable, particularly around scope fit, formatting, ethics, and revision documentation. Second, the editorial office should continue using structured reviewer guidance and decision synthesis to improve consistency. Third, production quality should explicitly include metadata completeness, DOI registration, author identifiers, and structured abstracts as non-negotiable publication components. Fourth, fee transparency and waiver practices should be

communicated in straightforward language across journal websites and call-for-paper materials.

Editorial policy should also be understood as a governance framework for fairness, clarity, and scholarly development, not simply as a workflow system for moving manuscripts from submission to publication. Journals that communicate expectations clearly, support equitable participation, and align their operations with responsible research practices are better positioned to build trust among authors, reviewers, and partner institutions. This broader view is especially important for mentorship-driven publishing models, where editorial systems are expected not only to evaluate manuscripts, but also to strengthen

the research culture around them (Dine et al., 2024).

A fifth implication is methodological: if Koozakar wishes to present itself publicly as a data-informed publisher, it should begin to collect and report a limited set of verified internal indicators, such as median time to first editorial decision, median time in review, median time from acceptance to publication, and the share of manuscripts returned for technical correction before peer review. Publishing a few credible indicators is more persuasive than reporting many precise but weakly documented numbers.

Table 3: Recommended Actions for a More Credible and Efficient Workflow

Policy Area	Recommended Action	Expected Benefit
Editorial transparency	Publish concise workflow guidance and a small set of verified timeline indicators	Improves trust and manages author expectations
Peer review support	Use reviewer templates, reminders, and synthesized decision letters	Improves review consistency and author clarity
Revision discipline	Require point-by-point responses and clean editable files	Reduces ambiguity and eases second-round handling
Metadata quality	Standardize DOI, ORCID, title, abstract, and keyword practices	Strengthens discoverability and record quality
Access and equity	State APCs, waivers, and ownership information transparently	Improves legitimacy and inclusiveness
Technology governance	Pilot automation with human oversight and periodic audit	Supports efficiency without weakening accountability

CONCLUSION

Koozakar's publishing workflow can be presented credibly as a structured pathway from submission to publication, provided the claims made about that pathway are proportionate to the evidence available. This revised policy brief therefore shifts the emphasis from unsupported numerical precision to defensible editorial principles. It shows that trustworthy workflow communication depends on clear triage rules, ethical and supported peer review, disciplined revision practices, strong metadata, transparent fee policies, and cautious deployment of automation.

The broader lesson is simple: editorial credibility grows when publishers say clearly what they do, support those claims with verified practice, and improve incrementally where evidence reveals a

bottleneck. On that basis, Koozakar is well positioned to communicate an author-centered and integrity-conscious model of scholarly publishing, while developing the internal monitoring needed for stronger public reporting in the future.

REFERENCES

- Björk, B.-C., & Solomon, D. (2013). The publishing delay in scholarly peer-reviewed journals. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7(4), 914-923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.09.001>
- Committee on Publication Ethics. (n.d.). Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>
- Crossref. (2024, December 3). Metadata beyond discoverability. Crossref Blog. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://www.crossref.org/blog/metadata-beyond-discoverability/>
- Directory of Open Access Journals. (n.d.). Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing.

- Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://doaj.org/apply/transparency/>
- Dine, R. D., Elkheir, L. Y. M., Raimi, M. O., Alemayehu, M., Mohamed, S. Y., Turzin, J. K., Arogundade, F. Q., Ochola, E. A., Nasiyo, A. M., Mwawanga, R. Q., & Yabo, Y. A. (2024). Ten simple rules for successful and sustainable African research collaborations. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 20(6), e1012197. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1012197>
- Egbetokun, A. (2026). Editorial responsibility: A primer. *Nature and Trends in Science & Technology*, 2(1), i-iv. <https://doi.org/10.69798/98324897>
- Huisman, J., & Smits, J. (2017). Duration and quality of the peer review process: The author's perspective. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 633-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5>
- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2026). Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>
- Langham-Putrow, A., Bakker, C., & Riegelman, A. (2021). Is the open access citation advantage real? A systematic review of the citation of open access and subscription-based articles. *PLOS ONE*, 16(6), e0253129. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253129>
- ORCID. (n.d.). Peer reviews. Retrieved March 24, 2026, from <http://support.orcid.org/hc/en-us/articles/360006971333-Peer-Reviews>