



INTELLIGENT PUBLISHING SOLUTIONS

DNE WHITE PAPER SERIES

The Ultimate Guide to Digital Journal Management Systems

2026 EDITION

A comprehensive review of editorial management, publishing platforms, production technologies, and future trends in scholarly publishing.

REPORT ID

DNE-WP-2026-001

PREPARED BY

DoNotEdit

LAST REVIEWED

August 2026

www.donotedit.com | info@donotedit.com

How to Use This Guide

This white paper provides editors, scholarly societies, university presses, and publishers with a structured overview of modern journal management and publishing technologies. It distinguishes editorial workflow systems from production and hosting platforms, compares major options, and offers a practical framework for platform selection.

Important: Platform features, pricing, integrations, and commercial terms evolve. This report is a decision-support resource, not a substitute for a current vendor demonstration or an independent technical assessment.

Contents

Understanding the Modern Scholarly Publishing Ecosystem	01
A Comprehensive Review of Leading Platforms	02
Feature Comparison Matrix	03
How to Choose the Right Platform	04
Conclusions and Strategic Recommendations	05

Suggested citation: DoNotEdit. The Ultimate Guide to Digital Journal Management Systems in 2026. DoNotEdit White Paper Series; DNE-WP-2026-001.

01 SECTION 1

Understanding the Modern Scholarly Publishing Ecosystem

Why Journal Management Systems Matter More Than Ever

Scientific publishing has changed dramatically over the past two decades. What was once a paper-based editorial process has evolved into a sophisticated digital ecosystem where manuscripts are submitted, reviewed, edited, published, indexed, archived, and discovered entirely online.

Today, a journal's success depends not only on the quality of the research it publishes but also on the efficiency of its publishing infrastructure. Editors are expected to manage increasing submission volumes, coordinate international reviewers, maintain publication ethics, comply with indexing requirements, distribute accurate metadata, and publish articles quickly—all while operating with limited editorial resources.

A modern journal management system has therefore become much more than manuscript submission software. It is the operational backbone of scholarly publishing.

Whether a journal publishes twenty articles annually or several thousand, the technology supporting its editorial workflow directly influences publication quality, author satisfaction, editorial productivity, discoverability, and ultimately the journal's scientific reputation.

From Editorial Software to Publishing Ecosystems

Early journal management systems focused almost exclusively on manuscript submission and peer review. Their primary objective was to replace email communication and paper-based workflows with centralized online processes.

Over time, however, publishers recognized that editorial management represented only one component of a much larger publishing workflow.

Today's publishing platforms increasingly support:

- Manuscript submission
- Editorial screening
- Reviewer assignment
- Peer review management
- Revision tracking
- Copyediting

- Production management
- HTML, PDF, XML, and EPUB publishing
- DOI registration
- ORCID integration
- Metadata distribution
- Crossref deposits
- Long-term archiving
- Search engine optimization
- Reader analytics
- Institutional authentication
- Digital preservation

Consequently, many platforms have evolved into comprehensive publishing ecosystems rather than simple editorial management systems.

The Complete Scholarly Publishing Workflow

Many editors view manuscript submission as the central component of journal management. In reality, submission represents only the beginning of a considerably larger publishing lifecycle.

A simplified workflow typically includes:

- Manuscript submission
- Initial editorial screening
- Peer review
- Editorial decision
- Author revision
- Copyediting
- Technical editing
- Production
- Online publication
- Metadata registration
- Indexing
- Long-term preservation
- Performance monitoring

Each stage introduces different technical requirements and often relies on different software tools.

Understanding this broader workflow is essential when evaluating publishing platforms because no single system necessarily performs every stage equally well.

Editorial Workflow Versus Production Workflow

One of the most common misconceptions in scholarly publishing is treating editorial management and production as identical processes.

They are not.

The editorial workflow focuses primarily on scientific decision-making.

Typical editorial activities include:

- Managing submissions
- Assigning editors
- Selecting reviewers
- Monitoring peer review
- Recording editorial decisions
- Communicating with authors

The production workflow begins only after a manuscript has been accepted.

Production activities commonly include:

- Copyediting
- Typesetting
- Figure preparation
- Table formatting
- Reference verification
- Metadata validation
- HTML generation
- XML production
- PDF creation
- Accessibility improvements
- Final publication

Many publishing delays occur not during peer review but during production, highlighting the importance of selecting technologies that support efficient post-acceptance workflows.

The Expanding Role of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence is rapidly transforming scholarly publishing.

While AI is unlikely to replace editorial expertise, it is increasingly being used to automate repetitive tasks and improve editorial efficiency.

Current applications include:

- Language improvement
- Metadata extraction
- Reference verification
- Reviewer recommendations

- Integrity screening
- Similarity analysis
- Production assistance
- Accessibility evaluation
- Image quality assessment

Rather than replacing editors, AI functions as an intelligent assistant capable of reducing manual workload while helping editorial teams identify potential issues earlier in the publication process.

As AI technologies continue to mature, editorial teams will likely spend less time on repetitive administrative tasks and more time on scientific evaluation and editorial decision-making.

The Growing Importance of Publishing Standards

Scientific publishing has become increasingly interconnected.

Modern journals are expected to comply with numerous international standards, recommendations, and technical requirements.

Examples include:

- COPE publication ethics
- ICMJE recommendations
- Crossref metadata standards
- ORCID integration
- DOI registration
- Open access policies
- Research reporting guidelines
- Digital preservation requirements
- Accessibility recommendations
- Indexing criteria

Compliance with these standards not only improves publication quality but also strengthens a journal's eligibility for international indexing services and enhances its long-term visibility.

Technology therefore plays a critical role in supporting—not replacing—editorial governance.

Key Characteristics of Modern Journal Platforms

Although publishing platforms differ substantially in architecture and target users, the most successful systems typically share several characteristics.

A modern journal management platform should provide:

- Secure manuscript submission

- Flexible editorial workflows
- Efficient peer review management
- Comprehensive user role management
- Metadata quality control
- Persistent identifier integration
- Scalable production workflows
- Reliable online publication
- Search engine visibility
- Long-term preservation support
- Integration with external scholarly services
- Reporting and analytics

The relative importance of each capability varies depending on the journal's size, publishing model, technical resources, and strategic objectives.

Why Selecting a Platform Is a Strategic Decision

Choosing a journal management system should never be viewed simply as purchasing software.

A publishing platform influences nearly every aspect of a journal's operation, including editorial efficiency, publication speed, production costs, author experience, reviewer engagement, discoverability, indexing readiness, and long-term sustainability.

Migrating between platforms can be technically complex and resource-intensive, making early technology decisions particularly important.

Editors should therefore evaluate not only current functionality but also future scalability, interoperability, maintenance requirements, and the platform's ability to adapt to emerging publishing technologies.

Looking Ahead

The scholarly publishing ecosystem continues to evolve rapidly. Open-source platforms are becoming increasingly sophisticated, commercial publishers continue investing in enterprise publishing infrastructures, and artificial intelligence is reshaping editorial and production workflows.

Understanding these developments is the first step toward making informed technology decisions.

In the following section, we examine the world's leading journal management platforms, comparing their strengths, limitations, ideal use cases, and the types of publishers they are designed to support.

SECTION 2

A Comprehensive Review of Today's Leading Journal Publishing Platforms

02

Introduction

Selecting a journal management platform is one of the most important strategic decisions for any scholarly publisher. However, comparing publishing systems is far more complex than comparing ordinary software products.

Some platforms are designed primarily for manuscript submission and peer review, while others focus on production, online hosting, XML publishing, analytics, or enterprise-scale publishing operations. Consequently, there is no universally “best” platform. The optimal choice depends on a journal’s editorial workflow, publishing volume, technical expertise, available resources, and long-term strategic goals.

Rather than ranking these systems from first to last, this review categorizes them according to their primary strengths and intended users.

2.1 Open-Source Journal Management Systems

Open-source publishing platforms have become the backbone of scholarly publishing for thousands of universities, research institutions, academic societies, and independent journals worldwide. Their popularity stems from flexibility, community support, and freedom from licensing costs.

These systems are particularly attractive to organizations wishing to maintain complete control over their publishing infrastructure.

Open Journal Systems (OJS)

Open Journal Systems (OJS), developed by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP), is currently the world’s most widely adopted open-source journal management system. Thousands of journals across virtually every scientific discipline use OJS to manage submissions, peer review, editorial decisions, and online publication.

Major strengths

- Completely open source
- Extensive international user community
- Large plugin ecosystem
- Flexible editorial workflows

- Strong multilingual support
- Broad adoption by universities
- Active long-term development

OJS has evolved considerably since its first release. Earlier versions primarily emphasized editorial workflow, whereas recent development has increasingly focused on production efficiency, metadata quality, interoperability, and publishing automation.

For journals seeking maximum flexibility without recurring software licensing fees, OJS remains one of the strongest available solutions.

Potential limitations

Like most open-source platforms, OJS requires technical expertise for installation, maintenance, upgrades, security, and customization.

Large publishers operating hundreds of journals may also require additional integrations or enterprise services beyond the standard installation.

Best suited for

- Universities
- Academic societies
- Independent journals
- Government research organizations
- Small and medium-sized publishers

Janeway

Janeway is another open-source publishing platform that has gained attention for its modern architecture and emphasis on streamlined publishing workflows.

Unlike many legacy systems, Janeway was designed with contemporary web technologies and publishing practices in mind.

Key characteristics include:

- Modern user interface
- Flexible editorial workflow
- Open-source licensing
- Responsive article presentation
- Active institutional development

Janeway appeals particularly to organizations seeking an alternative to traditional editorial systems while maintaining full ownership of their publishing infrastructure.

Its ecosystem is considerably smaller than OJS, but its architecture reflects many recent developments in scholarly publishing.

Best suited for

- Innovative university presses

- Open-access publishers
- Digital-first journals

Kotahi

Kotahi represents a newer generation of open publishing platforms.

Rather than focusing exclusively on conventional journal publishing, Kotahi emphasizes configurable editorial workflows capable of supporting multiple publishing models.

Its flexible architecture allows publishers to customize editorial processes that extend beyond traditional manuscript management.

Key strengths include:

- Highly configurable workflows
- Modern software architecture
- Collaborative editing capabilities
- Strong integration potential
- Active open-source development

Kotahi is particularly interesting for publishers experimenting with innovative peer review models or alternative publishing workflows.

2.2 Enterprise Editorial Management Platforms

Enterprise platforms target medium and large publishers that require sophisticated workflow management, extensive reporting, advanced integrations, and professional technical support.

Unlike open-source systems, these platforms generally operate under commercial licensing models.

ScholarOne Manuscripts

ScholarOne has long been regarded as one of the leading manuscript submission and peer review systems used by major international publishers.

Its primary strengths include:

- Mature editorial workflow
- Powerful reviewer database management
- Sophisticated reporting
- Large-scale deployment
- Extensive publisher integrations

ScholarOne excels at handling high submission volumes while supporting complex editorial structures involving numerous editors and reviewers.

Because of its enterprise orientation, ScholarOne is more commonly adopted by large commercial publishers and scientific societies than by small independent journals.

Best suited for

- Large publishers
- High-volume journals
- International scholarly societies

Editorial Manager

Editorial Manager is another enterprise-grade editorial platform widely adopted by commercial publishers.

The platform offers highly configurable editorial workflows together with extensive integration capabilities.

Major strengths include:

- Flexible workflow customization
- Enterprise scalability
- Strong technical support
- Publisher integrations
- Comprehensive reporting

Editorial Manager has become particularly popular among publishers operating multiple journals requiring centralized editorial oversight.

JAMS

JAMS has evolved into a comprehensive journal management environment supporting editorial operations together with additional publishing services.

Its strengths include:

- Editorial workflow management
- Manuscript tracking
- Reviewer coordination
- Journal administration
- Publishing support

JAMS primarily targets organizations seeking integrated editorial management without necessarily building extensive internal technical infrastructure.

2.3 End-to-End Publishing Platforms

Some organizations provide considerably more than editorial software.

Instead of managing only manuscript submission and peer review, these platforms integrate editorial management, production, online publication, hosting, analytics, and publishing services into a unified environment.

ARPHA

ARPHA is one of the most comprehensive scholarly publishing platforms currently available.

Its philosophy differs significantly from conventional editorial systems.

Rather than providing individual software modules, ARPHA offers an integrated publishing ecosystem covering nearly every stage of the publishing lifecycle.

Typical capabilities include:

- Manuscript submission
- Peer review
- Editorial management
- Production
- XML publishing
- HTML publication
- Online hosting
- Metadata dissemination
- Publishing analytics
- Semantic publishing

One of ARPHA's distinguishing characteristics is its close integration between editorial workflow and production.

Instead of treating production as a separate external activity, ARPHA incorporates production directly into its publishing environment.

Best suited for

- Professional publishers
- Growing publishing organizations
- Publishers seeking an all-in-one ecosystem

Silverchair

Silverchair focuses primarily on publishing infrastructure rather than manuscript management.

Its platform powers many internationally recognized publishers by providing sophisticated online publishing capabilities.

Strengths include:

- Excellent content presentation
- Powerful search capabilities
- Reader analytics

- Institutional authentication
- Scalable hosting

Silverchair is particularly strong after publication, helping publishers maximize discoverability and user experience.

Atypon Literatum

Atypon is another major publishing technology provider emphasizing digital content delivery.

Its platform supports:

- Online publication
- Subscription management
- Content discovery
- Reader engagement
- Institutional access

Many established publishers rely on Atypon to deliver scholarly content efficiently to global audiences.

HighWire

HighWire has decades of experience supporting scholarly publishers through digital publishing infrastructure.

Its platform combines hosting, discovery, analytics, and publishing services within a mature enterprise environment.

PubFactory

PubFactory positions itself as a comprehensive publishing platform supporting digital content delivery throughout the publishing lifecycle.

Its strengths include:

- Flexible hosting
- Discoverability
- Metadata management
- Content distribution
- Publishing analytics

2.4 Production Technologies

Editorial management represents only part of scholarly publishing.

Once manuscripts have been accepted, publishers must transform author manuscripts into professionally published articles.

This production stage often includes:

- Copyediting

- Typesetting
- Figure preparation
- Table formatting
- Reference verification
- XML generation
- HTML production
- PDF creation
- EPUB production

Numerous specialized technology providers operate in this segment.

Representative organizations include:

- Typefi
- TNQ
- Aptara
- Nova Techset
- Straive
- Lumina Datamatics
- Integra
- MPS
- Sheridan
- Exeter Premedia

These companies frequently combine automation with professional publishing services, enabling publishers to outsource complex production workflows.

2.5 Comparative Overview

The current publishing technology landscape can be broadly summarized as follows:

Platform Category	Primary Strength	Typical Users
Open-source platforms	Flexibility and low cost	Universities, societies, independent journals
Enterprise editorial systems	Workflow management	Large publishers
Publishing ecosystems	End-to-end publishing	Commercial publishers
Hosting platforms	Digital publication and reader experience	Professional publishers
Production technologies	Post-acceptance article production	Publishers requiring specialized production support

No single platform dominates every aspect of scholarly publishing.

Some excel at editorial workflow.

Others specialize in production.

Others focus on hosting and digital dissemination.

Understanding these differences allows publishers to evaluate technology based on their actual operational requirements rather than software popularity.

Key Takeaways

Several important observations emerge from today's publishing landscape.

First, journal management platforms are becoming increasingly interconnected. Editorial workflow, production, metadata management, online publication, and analytics are no longer isolated activities.

Second, automation is expanding rapidly throughout scholarly publishing. Modern platforms increasingly incorporate AI-assisted workflows, production automation, and metadata enrichment to improve efficiency while reducing repetitive manual work.

Third, publishers are placing greater emphasis on interoperability. Integration with services such as Crossref, ORCID, indexing databases, preservation systems, and institutional repositories has become a core expectation rather than an optional feature.

Finally, successful platform selection depends less on identifying a universally superior system and more on choosing technology that aligns with a journal's editorial objectives, publishing model, available resources, and long-term growth strategy.

In the next section, we move beyond software comparisons and explore how editors and publishers can systematically evaluate their own needs, avoid common technology selection mistakes, and develop a future-ready publishing strategy.

SECTION 3

How to Choose the Right Journal Management Platform

There Is No Universal “Best” Journal Management System

After reviewing today’s leading journal publishing platforms, one conclusion becomes immediately clear: there is no universally superior journal management system.

Every platform has been designed with a different audience, publishing model, and operational philosophy in mind.

An editorial system that works exceptionally well for a multinational commercial publisher may be unnecessarily complex for a university journal publishing fifty articles per year. Conversely, software designed for a small editorial office may struggle to support hundreds of editors managing thousands of submissions annually.

The objective should therefore never be to identify the “best” platform.

Instead, editors should identify the platform that best supports their journal’s current needs while remaining capable of supporting future growth.

Step 1 - Understand Your Journal Before Evaluating Software

Technology should always follow editorial strategy—not the other way around.

Before requesting software demonstrations or comparing feature lists, every editorial board should answer several fundamental questions.

Publishing Volume

- How many submissions are received each year?
- How many articles are published annually?
- Is rapid growth expected?

Submission volume directly influences workflow complexity, reviewer management, reporting requirements, and infrastructure needs.

Editorial Team

Editors should evaluate:

- Number of Editors-in-Chief
- Associate Editors
- Section Editors
- Editorial Assistants

- Technical Editors
- Production Staff

Larger editorial teams generally require more sophisticated permission management and workflow automation.

Publishing Model

Different journals operate under different publishing models.

Examples include:

- Diamond Open Access
- Gold Open Access
- Subscription
- Hybrid Publishing
- Society Publishing
- University Publishing

Each model introduces different operational requirements.

Technical Resources

A critical but often overlooked question is:

Who will maintain the platform?

Some organizations have dedicated IT departments.

Others rely entirely on external vendors.

Open-source solutions may provide greater flexibility, but they also require ongoing technical expertise for installation, security, updates, and troubleshooting.

Step 2 - Evaluate the Entire Publishing Workflow

Many journals compare software based only on manuscript submission features.

This is a mistake.

Editors should evaluate every stage of the publishing lifecycle.

Questions to consider include:

Can the platform efficiently support:

- manuscript submission?
- reviewer assignment?
- editorial decisions?
- production management?
- online publication?
- metadata export?
- DOI registration?

- indexing preparation?
- long-term preservation?

Ignoring later stages often results in costly workflow bottlenecks after manuscripts have already been accepted.

2.5 Feature Comparison Matrix of Major Journal Management and Publishing Platforms

Comparing scholarly publishing platforms requires more than checking whether each system supports manuscript submission or peer review. Platforms differ significantly in scope, ownership model, technical architecture, production capabilities, target users, and level of service.

Some systems primarily manage submission and editorial decision-making. Others cover the complete publishing lifecycle, including production, hosting, dissemination, and analytics. A number of platforms are open source and self-hosted, while enterprise products are generally delivered as managed commercial services.

The following matrix provides a practical, high-level comparison of ten major journal management and publishing platforms. It should be used as an initial decision-support resource rather than a substitute for a detailed technical assessment or vendor demonstration.

Comparison Key

- Yes: A clearly documented native capability
- Partial: Available with limitations, additional configuration, plugins, or selected services
- Integration: Generally provided through a third-party system or external integration
- Service: Available as a managed or professional publishing service rather than standard self-service software
- Not primary: Technically possible in some deployments, but not a core focus of the platform
- Not publicly confirmed: Reliable public information was insufficient at the time of review

Core Platform Comparison

Platform	Primary Category	Open Source	Self-Hosted Option	Managed Hosting	Multi-Journal Support	Typical Target User
Open Journal Systems	Journal management and publishing	Yes	Yes	Yes, through PKP and service providers	Yes	Universities, societies, independent journals and small-to-medium publishers
Janeway	Journal management and publishing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	University presses, open-access publishers and scholarly institutions
Kotahi	Configurable publishing workflow	Yes	Yes	Available through service arrangements	Yes	Innovative publishers and organizations requiring customized workflows
ARPHA	End-to-end publishing platform	No	No standard public self-hosted model	Yes	Yes	Societies, institutions and professional open-access publishers
ScholarOne Manuscripts	Enterprise submission and peer review	No	No	Yes	Yes	Large publishers, societies and high-volume journals
Editorial Manager	Enterprise submission and peer review	No	No	Yes	Yes	Medium and large commercial or society publishers
JAMS	Modular journal management platform	No	Primarily cloud-based	Yes	Yes	Small and medium-sized journals and publishers
Silverchair Platform	Enterprise hosting and content delivery	No	No	Yes	Yes	Established scholarly and professional publishers
Atypon Literatum	Enterprise publishing and content delivery	No	No	Yes	Yes	Large publishers and scholarly societies
KGL PubFactory	Publishing, production and hosting platform	No	No	Yes	Yes	University presses, societies and medium-to-large publishers

OJS is freely downloadable and can be installed on an institution's own server. It supports one or multiple journals, configurable editorial workflows, multilingual publishing and rich metadata.

Janeway is also open source and supports customizable submissions, multiple peer-review models, copyediting, typesetting, version control and publication in JATS XML, HTML and PDF.

ARPHA positions itself as a complete publishing environment combining automated functionality with human-delivered publishing services. Its workflow can cover submission, peer review, editing, production, publication, dissemination and archiving.

ScholarOne Manuscripts is an enterprise-scale system focused primarily on the manuscript lifecycle from submission through editorial decision.

Silverchair reports that it supports more than 9,000 journal sites and processes more than three million manuscripts annually.

Editorial Workflow Features

Platform	Online Submission	Configurable Workflow	Reviewer Management	Multiple Review Models	Automated Reminders	Editorial Roles and Permissions	Research Integrity Integration
OJS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial / plugins
Janeway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Kotahi	Yes	Strong	Yes	Configurable	Yes	Yes	Integration
ARPHA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes / service-supported
ScholarOne	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong
Editorial Manager	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong
JAMS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Single-blind, double-blind and open review	Yes	Yes	Partial / developing
Silverchair Platform	Not primary	Integration	Not primary	Not primary	Not primary	Yes	Integration
Atypon Literatum	Not primary	Integration	Not primary	Not primary	Not primary	Not primary	Integration
KGL PubFactory	Through connected services	Integration	Through connected services	Integration	Integration	Yes	Yes / service-supported

OJS supports submission, editorial review, peer review, copyediting, production and publication through a role-based workflow controlled by the journal.

Janeway explicitly supports open, anonymous and triple-anonymous review models and provides assignable roles, email templates and version control.

ScholarOne provides configurable workflows covering submission, administrative checks, pre-review screening, editor assignment, reviewer selection, recommendations and final decisions. It also integrates with external research-integrity and scholarly infrastructure partners.

JAMS supports customizable submission and editorial workflows. Its public documentation describes single-blind, double-blind and open review, as well as automated anonymization according to the chosen review model.

Production and Publication Capabilities

Platform	Copyediting Workflow	Typesetting Support	Native HTML Publication	PDF Publication	ATS XML	EPUB	Figure and Table Management	Production Services
OJS	Yes	Workflow support	Yes, as article galleys; expanding production capabilities	Yes	Partial / plugins and evolving native support	Partial	Yes	External providers commonly used
Janeway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not publicly emphasized	Yes	Available through hosting/service partners
Kotahi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not publicly emphasized	Yes	Depending on deployment
ARPHA	Yes	Yes	Yes, semantically enriched	Yes	Yes	Partial	Strong	Yes
ScholarOne	Limited after acceptance	Not primary	No	No	Integration	Integration	Submission-stage support	External production systems
Editorial Manager	Limited after acceptance	Not primary	No	No	Integration	Integration	Submission-stage support	External production systems
JAMS	Yes / modular	Service available	Yes through production and hosting services	Yes	Available through services	Not publicly confirmed	Yes	Yes
Silverchair Platform	Receives produced content	No	Yes	Yes	Yes / content ingestion	Selected content types	Strong presentation	Through connected vendors
Atypen Literatum	Receives produced content	No	Yes	Yes	Structured content support	Selected content types	Strong presentation	Through publisher production workflow
KGL PubFactory	Yes through KGL services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes for applicable content	Strong	Yes

A crucial distinction is that supporting HTML publication does not necessarily mean automatically converting an author's Word manuscript into final, publication-ready HTML. Many platforms accept prepared HTML, PDF or XML files as publication formats while relying on publishers, production vendors or separate tools to create them.

Janeway explicitly documents copyediting and typesetting functionality, together with support for JATS XML, PDF and HTML articles.

ARPHA publishes articles in PDF, machine-readable JATS XML and semantically enriched HTML as part of its integrated workflow.

KGL's end-to-end services include project management, AI-assisted language analysis, copyediting, XML composition, proofing, digital and print production, and online hosting through PubFactory.

OJS covers peer review, editing, publication and archiving, while allowing journals to publish article galleys in multiple formats. However, the exact level of automated document conversion depends on the OJS version, plugins and production workflow used by the journal.

Metadata, Identifiers and Scholarly Infrastructure

Platform	DOI Support	ORCID Integration	Research Integration	Self-Archive Metadata	Linking Support	Interconnection Support	Repository Integration
OJS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, through plugins and preservation networks	Yes
Janeway	Yes	Yes / configurable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kotahi	Integration	Integration	Integration	Yes	Integration	Integration	Integration
ARPHA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes
ScholarOne	Integration	Yes	Yes	Strong at submission stage	Publisher-dependent	Publisher-dependent	Integration
Editorial Manager	Integration	Yes	Yes / publisher workflow	Strong at submission stage	Publisher-dependent	Publisher-dependent	Integration
JAMS	Yes	Available	Available	Yes	Yes	Available through services	Partial
Silverchair Platform	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes
Atypen Literatum	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes
KGL PubFactory	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong	Yes	Yes

OJS emphasizes rich publication metadata, multiple languages, indexing support and integration with the broader scholarly publishing ecosystem.

ScholarOne publicly documents integrations with Crossref, ORCID, Copyright Clearance Center and Ringgold, along with API development and expanded interoperability partnerships.

Janeway includes full metadata support, archiving and discovery functionality, and an integrated repository system.

The quality of metadata deposited into external services remains partly dependent on the journal's own data-entry practices. A platform may support Crossref or ORCID technically while still allowing incomplete, inconsistent or inaccurate metadata to enter the publishing workflow.

Hosting, Discovery and Reader Experience

Platform	Journal Website Hosting	Responsive Design	Advanced Search	Reader Analytics	Journalist Authentication	Subscription Support	Open Access Support
OJS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Basic / plugins	Partial / plugins	Yes	Strong
Janeway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Available	Partial	Configurable	Strong
Kotahi	Partial / depends on deployment	Yes	Configurable	Integration	Integration	Not primary	Strong
ARPHA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Available	Available by model	Strong
ScholarOne	No, submission-facing sites only	Yes	Submission search	Editorial reporting	Not applicable to publication	Not applicable	Model-neutral
Editorial Manager	No, submission-facing sites only	Yes	Submission search	Editorial reporting	Not applicable to publication	Not applicable	Model-neutral
JAMS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Available	Available	Strong
Silverchair Platform	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Yes
Atypon Literatum	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Yes
KGL PubFactory	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Yes

Submission systems and publishing websites should not be confused. ScholarOne and Editorial Manager primarily manage interactions among authors, reviewers and editors. Platforms such as Silverchair, Literatum and PubFactory primarily present published content to readers and institutions.

JAMS offers journal website hosting with content-management functionality, article search, advanced filtering, personalized alerts and integrations intended to improve discoverability.

PubFactory is designed to host journals, books, databases and reference works, and is used by established university presses and scholarly publishers.

Artificial Intelligence and Automation

Platform	AI-Assisted Manuscript Discovery	Automated Submission Checks	Metadata Extraction	Language Support	Research Integrity Screening	Publication Automation	Robust AI Strategy
OJS	Plugins / integrations	Partial	Increasing	Integration	Plugins / integrations	Increasing	Development-focused
Janeway	Integration	Partial	Partial	Integration	Integration	Partial	Limited public emphasis
Kotahi	Integration	Configurable	Yes / workflow-dependent	Integration	Integration	Strong workflow automation	Yes
ARPHA	Available	Yes	Yes	Service-supported	Yes	Strong	Yes
ScholarOne	Yes / integrations	Yes	Yes	Integration	Strong	Workflow automation	Strong
Editorial Manager	Yes / integrations	Yes	Yes	Integration	Strong	Workflow automation	Strong
JAMS	Yes	Yes	Partial	Service-supported	Developing	Yes	Yes
Silverchair Platform	Selected AI features and integrations	Not primary	Content-dependent	Integration	Connected through ecosystem	Content automation	Yes
Atypon Literatum	Selected AI and discovery features	Not primary	Content-dependent	Integration	Connected through ecosystem	Content automation	Yes
KGL PubFactory	Yes through KGL services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong	Strong

ScholarOne identifies research integrity, modernization and artificial intelligence among its strategic priorities. Its system combines configurable editorial workflows with automated checks and partner integrations.

JAMS publicly offers an AI-powered reviewer finder that uses semantic matching to identify relevant experts for submitted manuscripts.

KGL has announced AI-assisted infrastructure for research-integrity oversight and also provides AI-supported language analysis and copyediting within its wider publishing services.

AI features require careful interpretation. A platform described as “AI-powered” may use AI for only one specific function, such as reviewer matching, summarization or language analysis. Editors should ask vendors to identify exactly which tasks are automated, which data are processed, how results are validated, and whether human oversight remains part of the workflow.

Pricing and Implementation Model

Platform	Licensing Model	Public Pricing	Implementation Complexity	Technical Maintenance Responsibility	Key Cost Driver
OJS	Free open-source license	Software free; hosting and services vary	Moderate	Journal, institution or hosting provider	Low to moderate
Janeway	Open source	Software free; services vary	Moderate	Institution or service provider	Low to moderate
Kotahi	Open source	Deployment and services vary	Moderate to high	Publisher or service provider	Variable
ARPHA	Commercial managed platform and services	Selected pricing information may be available	Moderate	Provider	Moderate to high
ScholarOne	Enterprise commercial	Quote-based	High	Provider, with publisher configuration	High
Editorial Manager	Enterprise commercial	Quote-based	High	Provider, with publisher configuration	High
JAMS	Commercial modular / freemium options	Pricing tools and plans available	Low to moderate	Provider	Low to moderate, depending on modules
Silverchair Platform	Enterprise commercial	Quote-based	High	Provider	High
Atypen Literaturum	Enterprise commercial	Quote-based	High	Provider	High
KGL PubFactory	Enterprise platform and services	Quote-based	High	Provider	High

“Free software” does not mean zero-cost publishing. An OJS or Janeway implementation may still require expenditure for hosting, installation, upgrades, security, theme development, plugin maintenance, migration, technical support and production services.

Conversely, commercial enterprise platforms may include hosting, system maintenance, configuration assistance, service-level agreements and professional support within their contracts.

JAMS describes itself as modular and allows journals to select only the functions required. It also provides pricing tools and has announced a freemium approach intended to broaden access, including support for diamond open-access journals and publishers in the Global South.

Platform Strengths at a Glance

Platform	Main Distinctive Strength	Main Consideration
OJS	Ownership, flexibility, affordability and a broad global ecosystem	Requires technical maintenance and may need plugins or external services
Janeway	Modern open-source publishing with integrated article production formats	Smaller ecosystem than OJS
Kotahi	Highly configurable and innovative publishing workflows	May require specialized implementation expertise
ARPHA	Integrated editorial, production, publication and dissemination environment	Greater dependence on a managed ecosystem
ScholarOne	Proven high-volume manuscript and peer-review management	Primarily an enterprise submission system rather than a publication-production platform
Editorial Manager	Highly configurable enterprise editorial workflow	Cost and implementation may be unsuitable for small journals
JAMS	Modular services and accessibility for small-to-medium publishers	Feature depth may depend on selected modules and services
Silverchair	Enterprise content hosting, discovery and reader experience	Usually requires separate submission and production systems
Atypon Literatum	Large-scale digital publishing, access and commercial content delivery	Primarily designed for established publishers
KGL PubFactory	Combination of production services, hosting and digital publishing	Enterprise service model rather than lightweight self-service software

Which Platform Is Best for Which Publisher?

Small independent or university journal

OJS is often the most practical starting point when the journal has access to reliable technical support and wants to retain control of its website, data and editorial workflow.

JAMS may be attractive to journals preferring a managed, modular system with less responsibility for server maintenance.

Open-access university press

OJS and Janeway are strong candidates. Janeway may appeal to publishers prioritizing a modern open-access presentation and integrated support for structured formats, while OJS offers a larger global community and plugin ecosystem.

Innovative or experimental publisher

Kotahi may be suitable when conventional journal workflows are too restrictive and the publisher needs a highly configurable process.

Society seeking an end-to-end managed environment

ARPHA can be considered when the organization wants submission, peer review, production, publication, dissemination and professional services within a unified environment.

Large publisher with complex peer-review workflows

ScholarOne or Editorial Manager may be more appropriate when reviewer management, high submission volume, complex editorial roles, standardized workflows and enterprise reporting are the primary requirements.

Publisher seeking a high-end content platform

Silverchair, Atypon Literatum and KGL PubFactory are most relevant when the central need is scalable content hosting, institutional access, discovery, analytics, subscriptions and advanced reader experience.

Important Limitations of Feature Tables

Feature matrices simplify complex products and must be interpreted cautiously.

A “Yes” in a comparison table does not establish that:

- the feature is included in every plan;
- the feature works identically for all journals;
- configuration is included without additional cost;
- implementation requires no technical expertise;

- output quality is consistent across all content types;
- the feature is suitable for a journal’s particular workflow;
- the service can meet local legal, language or accessibility requirements.

Similarly, a platform may technically support HTML, XML, DOI deposits or ORCID integration without automatically guaranteeing the quality or completeness of the resulting files and metadata.

Before making a final decision, publishers should request:

- A live demonstration using a realistic manuscript;
- A detailed list of included and optional modules;
- Migration requirements and costs;
- API and integration documentation;
- Service-level and technical-support terms;
- Data-ownership and data-export provisions;
- Accessibility and security documentation;
- Examples from journals with similar publishing volume and structure;
- A complete estimate of implementation and long-term operating costs;
- Clarification of which production tasks remain the publisher’s responsibility.

Comparative Conclusion

The modern scholarly publishing market does not contain one platform that is objectively superior in every category.

OJS, Janeway and Kotahi emphasize openness, flexibility and institutional control.

ScholarOne and Editorial Manager focus on high-volume enterprise editorial management.

ARPHA provides a more integrated publishing lifecycle.

JAMS targets modular and managed journal operations.

Silverchair, Atypon Literatum and KGL PubFactory concentrate on large-scale digital publication, content delivery and reader experience.

The most appropriate choice depends on where a journal’s greatest operational challenge occurs.

A journal struggling with manuscript tracking may need a stronger editorial-management system.

A journal experiencing long delays after acceptance may need better production infrastructure.

A publisher with weak discoverability may require improved metadata, hosting and content-delivery capabilities.

A journal already using an adequate system may gain more from optimizing its current workflow than from undertaking a costly platform migration.

For this reason, platform selection should begin with a structured assessment of the journal—not with a vendor shortlist.

- Last reviewed: August 2026. Platform features and commercial terms may change; publishers should verify current functionality directly with each provider.

Step 3 - Think Beyond Today's Needs

Selecting publishing software should be viewed as a long-term investment.

Editorial teams should ask:

Where will this journal be five years from now?

Expected developments may include:

- increased submissions
- additional editors
- new journals
- multilingual publishing
- XML publishing
- international indexing
- improved production workflows
- AI-assisted editorial processes

Choosing a platform that cannot support future growth often leads to expensive migration projects.

Common Mistakes When Selecting Journal Software

During publishing consultancy projects, several recurring mistakes appear repeatedly.

Choosing the Lowest Cost Option

Lower licensing costs do not necessarily translate into lower long-term costs.

Maintenance, customization, staff training, production, migration, and technical support may ultimately exceed software licensing fees.

Focusing Only on Submission

Many journals spend months evaluating manuscript submission while paying little attention to production.

In reality, production often becomes one of the most time-consuming stages after manuscript acceptance.

Ignoring Metadata

High-quality metadata influences:

- discoverability
- indexing
- citation linking
- search visibility

Metadata quality should be considered a strategic publishing asset rather than an administrative task.

Underestimating Migration Complexity

Changing publishing platforms is rarely simple.

Migration often involves:

- user accounts
- submissions
- reviewer histories
- editorial decisions
- published articles
- metadata
- DOIs
- URLs
- search engine rankings

Planning migration carefully can prevent significant operational disruption.

Selecting Software Based on Marketing

Every software provider naturally emphasizes strengths.

Editors should therefore evaluate platforms according to their own editorial priorities rather than marketing materials.

Independent technical assessment frequently provides a more objective basis for decision-making.

Future Trends Editors Should Watch

Scientific publishing technology continues evolving rapidly.

Several developments are likely to influence journal management during the coming years.

Artificial Intelligence

AI will increasingly assist editorial offices through:

- reviewer suggestions
- language support
- technical screening
- metadata extraction
- production assistance
- workflow automation

Human editorial judgment will remain essential, but repetitive tasks are expected to become increasingly automated.

Production Automation

The interval between acceptance and publication is expected to shorten as production technologies become more automated.

Publishers are investing heavily in tools capable of accelerating article preparation while maintaining high production quality.

Interoperability

Future publishing systems will communicate more effectively with external scholarly services.

Editors should increasingly expect seamless integration with:

- Crossref
- ORCID
- institutional repositories
- preservation services
- indexing databases
- research information systems

Editorial Analytics

Publishing decisions are becoming increasingly data-driven.

Modern editorial offices benefit from monitoring indicators such as:

- submission trends
- reviewer performance
- acceptance rates
- publication times
- geographic diversity
- citation performance
- workflow efficiency

These insights support continuous editorial improvement.

A Practical Evaluation Checklist

Before selecting or upgrading a journal management platform, editorial teams should be able to answer “Yes” to most of the following questions:

- ✓ Does the platform support your current publishing volume?
- ✓ Can it scale as your journal grows?
- ✓ Does it integrate with essential scholarly infrastructure?
- ✓ Is the workflow intuitive for editors, reviewers, and authors?
- ✓ Are long-term maintenance requirements realistic?
- ✓ Can production workflows operate efficiently?
- ✓ Does the platform support future publishing innovations?
- ✓ Will it improve—not complicate—editorial operations?

A platform that satisfies today’s needs but cannot support tomorrow’s objectives may become a long-term obstacle rather than a strategic asset.

Final Thoughts

Selecting journal management technology is no longer simply an operational decision—it is a strategic publishing decision.

The right platform should strengthen editorial quality, improve operational efficiency, support sustainable growth, and provide a reliable foundation for future publishing innovation.

No software can compensate for weak editorial policies or poor publishing practices.

However, the right technology can significantly reduce administrative burden, improve workflow consistency, enhance discoverability, and allow editorial teams to focus on what matters most: publishing high-quality scientific research.

In the next section, we summarize the key findings of this review and discuss how publishers can evaluate their current publishing infrastructure through an independent technology assessment before making major investment decisions.

04 SECTION 4 Conclusions and Strategic Recommendations for Journal Editors and Publishers

The Future of Scholarly Publishing Is Not About Choosing Software

After examining today's leading journal management systems, one important conclusion becomes evident.

The future of scholarly publishing is not defined by software alone.

Instead, successful journals combine appropriate technology with efficient editorial workflows, sound publishing policies, high-quality production processes, and continuous quality improvement.

Even the most sophisticated publishing platform cannot compensate for inefficient editorial procedures, incomplete publication policies, inconsistent metadata, or weak production practices.

Technology should therefore be viewed as an enabler—not a replacement—for good editorial management.

Every Journal Has Different Priorities

Throughout this review, we have deliberately avoided identifying a single “best” journal management platform.

The reason is simple.

Publishing environments differ significantly.

A newly established university journal has very different priorities from an international publisher managing hundreds of journals.

Similarly, a society journal seeking inclusion in major indexing databases may prioritize editorial quality and publishing standards over enterprise-level workflow complexity.

The most appropriate solution always depends on the journal's objectives, available resources, publishing model, editorial structure, and long-term strategy.

Technology Is Only One Part of the Publishing Infrastructure

Journal management software represents only one component of a successful publishing ecosystem.

Editors should also regularly evaluate:

- Editorial policies
- Publication ethics
- Peer review procedures
- Website quality
- Metadata accuracy
- Article production workflows
- DOI registration
- ORCID implementation
- Reference quality
- Digital preservation
- Accessibility
- Search engine visibility
- Indexing readiness

Many journals focus considerable attention on software selection while overlooking these equally important operational components.

Long-term publishing success depends on strengthening the entire editorial infrastructure rather than optimizing a single software application.

Preparing for the Next Generation of Publishing

Scientific publishing continues to evolve rapidly.

Artificial intelligence, production automation, persistent identifiers, structured metadata, machine-readable content, and enhanced interoperability are becoming increasingly important across the publishing ecosystem.

Editors who regularly review and improve their publishing workflows will be better positioned to adapt to future developments.

Rather than reacting to technological change, successful journals adopt a culture of continuous improvement—evaluating editorial processes, production quality, digital infrastructure, and publishing standards on an ongoing basis.

A Practical Framework for Editorial Technology Decisions

Before investing in new publishing technology or migrating to another platform, editorial teams should consider the following questions:

Editorial Workflow

- Does our current workflow remain efficient as submission volume grows?

- Are editorial responsibilities clearly defined?

Publishing Infrastructure

- Does our platform support future publishing requirements?
- Are integrations with essential scholarly services adequate?

Production Quality

- Are accepted manuscripts converted efficiently into publication-ready articles?
- Are production workflows standardized and consistently documented?

Publishing Standards

- Are our editorial policies aligned with current international recommendations?
- Does our journal consistently maintain high-quality metadata and publication practices?

Long-Term Sustainability

- Can our current infrastructure support future growth?
- Are we investing in technology that will remain effective over the coming years?

Regularly reviewing these questions helps journals identify opportunities for improvement before operational challenges become significant.

Independent Evaluation Creates Better Decisions

Choosing a publishing platform should never rely solely on vendor demonstrations or software feature lists.

Independent assessment allows editorial teams to evaluate their publishing environment objectively, identify workflow bottlenecks, prioritize infrastructure improvements, and make technology decisions that support both current needs and future development.

In many cases, improving existing workflows proves more valuable than replacing software altogether.

A structured assessment often reveals opportunities to increase efficiency, strengthen publication quality, and reduce long-term operational costs without unnecessary disruption.

Final Thoughts

Scientific publishing has entered an era in which editorial excellence depends on the successful integration of people, processes, policies, and technology.

Journal management systems continue to evolve rapidly, offering increasingly sophisticated capabilities for editorial workflow, production, digital

publication, and interoperability.

However, the most successful journals are not necessarily those using the most expensive or feature-rich platforms.

They are the journals that understand their publishing objectives, evaluate their infrastructure objectively, adopt appropriate technologies, and continuously improve every stage of the editorial and publishing process.

Thoughtful planning, evidence-based decision making, and regular assessment remain the foundations of sustainable scholarly publishing.

Need an Independent Assessment of Your Journal?

Selecting the right technology is only one part of building a successful journal.

Whether you are launching a new journal, upgrading your editorial workflow, migrating to another platform, improving production processes, or preparing for international indexing, an independent technical assessment can help you identify opportunities that are often overlooked during routine editorial operations.

At DoNotEdit, we work with universities, scholarly societies, research institutions, and publishers to evaluate journal publishing infrastructure from a practical and evidence-based perspective.

Our consultancy services may include:

- Evaluation of journal management platforms
- Editorial workflow assessment
- Production workflow analysis
- Publishing policy review
- Metadata and DOI assessment
- Website structure evaluation
- Indexing readiness analysis
- Editorial best-practice recommendations
- Strategic publishing roadmaps

Every journal is unique, and every recommendation should be tailored to its specific goals.

If your editorial team is planning its next stage of development, we would be pleased to discuss your publishing objectives and explore practical strategies for improving quality, efficiency, and international visibility.



INTELLIGENT PUBLISHING SOLUTIONS

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Build Smarter. Publish Better.

Planning to launch a journal, modernize an editorial workflow, improve production quality, migrate platforms, or prepare for international indexing?

DoNotEdit helps scholarly journals, universities, societies, and publishers evaluate their infrastructure and create practical, evidence-based improvement roadmaps.

Platform evaluation • Workflow assessment • Production review
Metadata and DOI assessment • Indexing readiness • Strategic roadmaps

**Request Your Journal Technology
Assessment**

info@donotedit.com | www.donotedit.com