

Review Policy

Review of abstracts

The submitted abstracts will be sent to two reviewers. They will advise on the suitability of the abstracts for the seminar. The reviewers may suggest revision of the abstracts. In case of conflicting reports the internal editorial mechanism will decide on the course of action.

Review of papers

All submitted manuscripts are to be read by the editorial staff. To save time for authors and peer-reviewers, only those papers that seem most likely to meet our editorial criteria are sent for formal review. Those papers judged by the editors to be of insufficient general interest or otherwise inappropriate will be sent back to the authors requesting revisions as informal advice.

Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest are sent for formal review to two reviewers. The reviewers will give detailed comments and will recommend any one of the following

1. **Accept**, with or without suggested revisions
2. Invite the authors to **revise their manuscript** to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
3. Reject, but indicate to the authors that **further work might justify a resubmission**
4. **Reject outright**, typically on grounds of specialist interest, lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretation problems

In case of recommendation no. 2 the internal editorial system will review the resubmitted revised manuscript and advise for publication or reject.

We may return to the reviewers for further advice, particularly in cases where they disagree with each other, or where the authors believe they have been misunderstood on points of fact. We therefore ask that reviewers should be willing to provide follow-up advice as requested. We are very aware, however, that reviewers are usually reluctant to be drawn into prolonged disputes, so we try to keep consultation to the minimum. We shall contact them if we judge it necessary to provide a fair hearing for the authors.