Palgrave Studies in Communication for Social Change

Series Peer Review Guidance

Above all, Palgrave Macmillan cares deeply about the quality of our publishing and rigorous peer review is vital to this. We will support you with a thorough but fast and responsive peer review process. Guidance on the peer review process for the *Palgrave Studies in Communication for Social Change* series is as follows:

1. We ask that authors give a clear indication of how their project meets the aims of the series within the proposal form. Any relevant proposals that are not explicitly submitted for the series will be passed to the series for consideration.

2. When a proposal is received, the series editor will review the proposal with input from the advisory editorial board as necessary. At this stage the series editor might ask the author to revise and resubmit their proposal if it is in need of development from a scholarly perspective or indeed to adjust it for the needs of the series. NB if the author is a series editor or board member they will be excluded from the process of discussion and evaluation.

3. When the series editor is happy with the proposal, they provide Palgrave Macmillan with their feedback and/or endorsement of the proposal. The proposal is then sent for peer review to external experts in the field. It is standard to receive feedback from two peer reviewers, although we may seek more reviews if that is deemed necessary. We use single blind peer review, which means the reviewers will know who the authors are but the authors will not know the identity of the reviewers.

4. When the external peer review reports are received, they are first reviewed by the Palgrave editor and then shared with the series editor. Together the series editor and Palgrave editor will form a view on how to proceed with the project. Reviewers are asked to give a recommendation on how we proceed, the 3 options they can chose from are: accept with minor revisions / revise and resubmit as major revision is required / reject.

5. Depending on the feedback and changes suggested by the peer reviewers, an author might be asked to revise and resubmit their proposal with a detailed written response to the peer review feedback or asked simply to provide a detailed written response outlining the changes they will make. If the external peer reviews do not recommend proceeding with a proposal then the decision may be taken to reject the proposal at this stage.

6. Once a response to the peer review reports is received (and revised proposal documents if they have been requested), the series editor will review the documents and form a view on whether a second round of peer review is necessary. If so, steps 3-5 will be repeated. If the author response to the peer review does not address fundamental concerns raised then we may take the decision to reject the proposal at this stage.

7. After a project has been contracted and the full manuscript is received it is sent for external peer review to an expert in the field – this is known as a clearance read. Given that the project will have already been through rigorous peer review at proposal stage, we do not anticipate that major changes will be required here. However, an author might be asked to

make significant changes if the peer review suggests this is necessary, and the series editor and Palgrave editor agree. In very rare cases the manuscript may be rejected at this stage if the material does not meet the required scholarly standards.

8. When submitting their revision of their manuscript, authors are asked to outline the changes they made to the text and if they disagree with some of the remarks to explain their position.

9. Occasionally a manuscript may be sent for a second clearance review (or back to the original clearance reader for a second look) if significant changes were requested. The reviewer would then give a final recommendation to proceed with publication.