

Humanities – Arts and Humanities in Progress

Peer Review

The reviewing process within the series "Humanities - Arts and Humanities in Progress" is made in the following steps:

1. Given the goals and the scopes of the series, one important concern is to make sure that the proponent understands that this is not just "any" series in humanities, but it has a specific paradigm that implies some limits in the areas and topics. For this reason, Springer's proposal form has been implemented with a short questionnaire in which the proponent/s are invited to identify some of the key-characteristics of their proposal that makes it suitable for the series.

2. Once the proposal is received, the series' board performs a so-called pre-review of the "proposal" inside our scientific committee. There is a preliminary discussion within the whole board, then one member that is deemed particularly qualified to assess the proposal takes the task to write the actual evaluation on a specific form elaborated for the series.

At this stage, the main aspects that are evaluated are the strength of the proposal as such, the CVs of the proponent/s (mostly in terms of verifying the competences within the topic proposed), and most of all the pertinence within the scopes of the series.

Please, note that if the proponent/s are board members, the proposal is made anonymous in all the recognizable parts in order to avoid a conflict of interests. The given board member/s are also excluded from all communications concerning their proposal, and only informed when a decision has been taken.

3. During the pre-review, one of the English native speakers (there are four of them) also takes a general look at the quality of the English language, and in case recommendations are made for language-editing.

4. If the pre-review is successful, in accordance with Springer regulations, the series editor writes a letter of endorsement for the proposal. The letter concludes the pre-review process: the proponent/s are informed, asked to take into account the comments and requested to send the manuscript at the date they themselves indicate in the proposal form.

5. When the manuscript arrives it is submitted to two external anonymous reviewers, chosen among renowned experts in the given field.

Reviewers have four options: acceptance without revisions, acceptance with minor revisions, acceptance with major revisions, or rejection. If both reviews accept the manuscript (regardless of the amount of revisions required), the publication process proceeds, provided of course that such revisions are applied by the proponent/s. With one rejection and one full acceptance, a third review is required. With one rejection and one acceptance with revisions (no matter if minor or major) the manuscript is rejected.

To prevent the occasional rudeness that is sometimes displayed in this process, reviewers are asked to express their evaluation in a polite and constructive form, no matter how negative their opinions may be.

6. During the revision of their manuscript, proponent/s are asked to make their changes visible in the text and, when they disagree with some of the remarks, to explain the grounds for their disagreement.

7. Occasionally, reviewer/s may ask to take a second look to the manuscript, after the revisions, in order to give a final approval.



<http://www.springer.com/series/14105>

Numanities - Arts and Humanities in Progress

Series Ed.: Martinelli, D.

ISSN: 2510-442X