

## SCM Press Peer Review Policy (Dec 2025)



As an academic publisher, all prospective SCM Press titles undergo peer review to help ensure they meet our standards and are of appropriate quality for publication.

At present, all proposals are subject to peer review at proposal stage, using a completed proposal form outlining details of the proposed book project and also a sample chapter of the intended publication.

These reviews are single-anonymous: the reviewer knows who the proposal writer is but the reviewer's identity is kept from the proposal writer.

Where appropriate, a second peer review will be undertaken of the full manuscript once it is complete.

### **If you are submitting a proposal and sample material, please ensure the following:**

- That all information required on the proposal form is provided
- That you are happy for the sample material to be shared with reviewers
- That the sample material is tailored for the potential project (i.e. even if the research or material was published in your thesis or delivered as a conference paper, please ensure this is edited for the new audience).

These two process are outlined below.

#### **1. Proposal and sample**

- Proposal is submitted along with a sample (at least a chapter) and CV/résumé or equivalent details.
- Commissioning editor assesses the proposal for suitability for SCM Press. If the project could be part of one of our series, the series editor for that series will also assess its suitability.
- If happy to explore publication, commissioning editor will send proposal and sample to the peer reviewer. (For series titles, the peer reviewer(s) will be drawn from the editorial board for that series. The names of other potential peer reviewers will be redacted so that they will not see other names or contact details of prospective authors/editors.)
- The peer reviewer will submit their comments to the commissioning editor.
- The commissioning editor will feed back the peer review comments to the prospective author(s)/editor(s) and outline next steps (whether to move forward to approval meeting, to require further amendments or work on the proposal, or to reject the proposal).
- If amendments are required or recommended, author(s)/editor(s) must provide responses to any concerns raised.

- If taken forward for approval, the peer reviewer's comments and the authors'/editors' responses are considered as part of the process.

## **2. Full manuscript review**

The process will be carried out as above; if a project receives approval and a contract is signed, there will be an additional stage at the point of manuscript submission:

- The author(s)/editor(s) submit their full, complete manuscript to the commissioning editor.
- The commissioning editor checks that this has been submitted in full and sends this to a peer reviewer.
- The peer reviewer comments on the manuscript as a whole and returns their comments to the commissioning editor.
- The peer reviewer's comments are shared with the author(s)/editor(s), who must address these and update the manuscript as appropriate in order to proceed to publication. In the event of any disagreements, the commissioning editor will liaise with the peer reviewer and author(s)/editor(s) to resolve these.
- The peer review will not be conducted by the series editor if the proposed title would be part of a series.

## **FAQs**

### **What is assessed as part of a peer review?**

Things that will be assessed in a review include:

- The manuscript's contribution to the discipline
- The academic rigour and clarity of the contents
- The relevance and accuracy of the contents
- How the manuscript or proposed title is structured
- Whether the manuscript is appropriate for the intended audience

Peer reviewers are asked to complete a form as part of a review which covers these areas and asks them to specify whether they recommend that the manuscript be approved for publication, and whether this should be contingent on any changes.

The final decision as to whether or not to pursue a proposal, and if/when to take this forward for approval, rests with the commissioning editor.

Reviewers are NOT required or expected to comment overly on spelling, grammar and punctuation unless this is obscuring the meaning of some point being made – they may do so in passing if relevant, but the focus will be on the content of the writing, the overall argument(s) and quality of the scholarship.

### **Will you share everything you receive from the peer reviewer?**

At times, confidential comments to the commissioning editor (not to be seen by the author) may be provided to inform the commissioning editor's decision, but otherwise all review will be shared and discussed with the author(s)/editor(s).

### **How quickly will I hear back from peer review?**

We allow at least 6–8 weeks for each peer review.

Sometimes this can take less time if the reviewer is able to respond quickly, but please allow at least this time before enquiring. It can take longer if the person approached to review a proposal or manuscript is unable to take on the work and an alternative reviewer needs to be found.

Either way, the commissioning editor will let you know when they have a response from the reviewer and outline the next steps.

### **Ethics in academic peer review**

It is considered best practice in peer review to ensure that any potential conflict of interest is declared and avoided where necessary.

If a potential reviewer has a personal or professional relationship with the author(s), they must declare this and not review the work.

If the peer reviewer is also planning a similar project to the one outlined, or has been asked to review a similar book by another publisher or journal, they should not review.

For more on this topic, see the guidance here:

<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

If you have concerns about this or any potential misconduct, please contact the commissioning editor.