

Studies in Manuscript Cultures

Peer Review Guide

version 1.3 (released on 2 November 2023)

SMC operates a modified double-blind peer review process. Unless they wish otherwise, reviewers who recommend acceptance will be acknowledged collectively in a section of the introduction to the volume. All other referees will remain anonymous at all stages of the review and publication process. We try to anonymise the article/book under review as much as possible, but we are all aware that we are living in a small world. If you were able to guess the identity of the author of the article/book under review and you believe that there might be a conflict of interest between the author and yourself, please inform the editorial board immediately. By accepting the duty to perform a review, you also commit yourself to respect the confidentiality of the process and not to disseminate or use any part of the material that you will receive.

The articles contained in a collective volume dealing with a variety of topics and cultural or linguistic areas will be peer-reviewed individually, each by a different reviewer. The reviewers will be provided with the table of contents of the whole volume. Depending on the result of the individual reviews, a collective volume may be accepted even if some articles have to be rejected or it will need to be resubmitted as a whole.

The role of the reviewers is of prime importance for our series and we are very grateful for your time. We encourage referees to review the articles as soon as possible, preferably within four weeks. Please let us know if you expect to require more time than this.

We are sorry that we cannot offer a printed exemplar of the book to the reviewers, but we will inform you about the publication, which will be open access.

Title of the article under review

Recommendation of the Reviewer

Please choose one of the following four options:

- (1) Accept without changes
- (2) Accept with minor changes
- (3) To be resubmitted after major changes
- (4) Reject

Based on the review reports, the editorial board of the series will take a decision as to the acceptance or rejection of the article/book. Overall editorial responsibility rests with the editorial board of the series.

The recommendation needs to be substantiated (and should, of course, be fair and unbiased). Reviewers are asked to provide constructive feedback, even if an article is not deemed suitable for publication in the series.

Please write a **min. of 150 words**, considering especially the following points:

- The article under review must fit within the **scope** of the series as stated on our website (<https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/publications/smc.html>).
- It must introduce **new knowledge** and be the result of **original research**. If the material or part of the material has been published elsewhere (even in a different form), please inform the editorial board.
- The author must demonstrate that they are well acquainted with the **relevant scholarly bibliography** and the **state of the art** must be **up to date**.
- The **methodology** must be in accordance with the **highest standards of the scholarly tradition** in the specific field.
- The **argumentation** must be **rigorous** and substantiated by **sufficient material** provided in the article. The **illustrations** (figures, pictures, graphs, textual material) must be relevant and clear, in sufficient quality and the copyright must be cleared.
- SMC does not publish works of popularisation. However, in accordance with the multidisciplinary and global audience of the series, the article must provide sufficient context for readers who are not experts in its subject matter. **Jargon must be avoided** (concepts and technical terminology must be defined) and the article must be **accessible** to students and scholars of other corners of manuscript studies.
- The article must be **well-structured** and readable; repetitions must be avoided. If a revision of the English is needed, please let the editorial board know (the English copy-editing usually happens after the peer-review process).
- It should follow the formal **guidelines** for CSMC publications (<https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/publications/files/csmc-publications-stylesheet.pdf>).
- Each article in a collective volume should contain an **abstract**, which should adequately reflect the contents of the article.

Note that the CSMC does not take a positive or negative stance towards the use of AI technologies in the research and writing process. If AI technologies are used, the following rules have to be followed:

1. The use of generative models has to be acknowledged in the publication.
2. The authors must make sure that the use of generative models does not infringe anyone else's intellectual property and does not result in scientific misconduct, for example in the form of plagiarism.
3. All authors must explicitly consent to the use of each generative model.

The review will be forwarded to the author. Please provide comments and suggestions for improvement, if required. Detailed comments and corrections may be added to the PDF file containing the article (they should be anonymised) or as a list.

You may add (optional) confidential comments, meant solely for the editorial board of the series.