REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE SERIES IDEEN & ARGUMENTE (IDEAS & ARGUMENTS)

OBJECTIVE
The review process established for the Ideen&Argumente series is based on the peer review process used as standard at an international level, especially by leading Anglo-American academic and university publishers. The aim of this process is to undertake an independent quality check on incoming manuscripts by drawing on external, anonymous reviewers. It hopes to achieve two things: first, to contribute towards general quality assurance in the humanities and second, to generate greater transparency as regards the selection of manuscripts and communicate this to the wider world. In conjunction with this, the process also aims to provide authors with suggestions from fellow experts as to any possible manuscript revisions and replace the use of qualification reports with a more neutral procedure.

PROCESS STRUCTURE
The review process is made up of three phases. These cover all stages from the receipt of a manuscript to its acceptance or rejection by the series editors. Clear content rules and schedules must be observed.

Phase 1 (three weeks):
Incoming manuscripts are checked by the series editors to see whether they are fundamentally suitable for the series Ideen&Argumente. If they are, the series editors appoint two external reviewers. These are usually people working in the research field which the piece relates to. However, they should not be involved in the project in any way. Once initial contact has been made, the manuscript is sent to both reviewers.

Phase 2 (six weeks):
The reviewers produce a detailed assessment of the manuscript using a standardized questionnaire. As well as evaluating the quality and originality of the manuscript, this should contain concrete suggestions for improvements which are forwarded to the authors if the manuscript is accepted.

Phase 3 (two weeks):
On the basis of the two reports, the series editors decide whether to accept or reject the manuscript in question. If the two reviewers reach very different opinions, the manuscript may be forwarded to a third reviewer. The author is informed of the decision immediately. Any proposed amendments are sent to the author using the reports. The amount of time given to the author for revisions depends on the specific circumstances.

ANONYMITY
A double-blind review process is used. The reviewer is not given the author’s name before completing the assessment; neither is the author given the reviewers’ names following the evaluation. However, a reviewer may choose to reveal his or her name to the author. A list of reviewers who have previously worked for the publisher can also be found on the company’s website. Unless the reviewers explicitly object, the author is given access to the reports themselves in an anonymized form once the review process has been completed.