Spacetime Archives deems it crucial to make public the operational procedures of our journal, with a primary focus on transparency for our contributors. Initial submissions undergo review by an editorial board to ascertain alignment with the strategic goals of Spacetime Archives. This preliminary assessment is followed by a comprehensive review of papers for sophistication and content, ensuring equitable evaluation. Upholding academic integrity, submissions undergo rigorous plagiarism checks, with severe penalties, including parental notification, for any detected instances.

Following the initial stages, another editorial review phase ensues. Each submission is evaluated by either the managing editor or co-editors. For invitation-only submissions, those not invited are considered regular submissions. Peer reviewers diligently address key aspects in their reports, including the paper's coherence, logical flow, coverage in title and abstract, novelty of results, ethical considerations, replicability of methods, appropriateness of statistical analysis, clarity of data presentation, availability of underlying data, and alignment of conclusions with results. Additionally, reviewers confirm figures, tables, and references, ensuring adherence to ethical guidelines.

Managing editors have discretion to uphold Spacetime Archives' standards, rejecting submissions that fall short of expectations. Unanimous editor approval is required for a submission to progress, with a third reviewer intervening in case of conflicts. Authors retain the right to withdraw at any stage.

Recognizing the lengthy duration of the customary submission-to-publication process, Spacetime Archives conducts reviews both fairly and expeditiously. Peer reviewers are required to provide comments within 5 business days. All manuscripts undergo a single-blind peer review and peer reviewers adhere to the COPE Ethical Guidelines and are barred from direct contact with authors.

The Editor-in-Chief receives recommendations from peer reviewers regarding manuscript suitability for publication, accompanied by a scored evaluation ranging from 1 to 6, reflecting manuscript quality.