

## *B.A.S. British and American Studies*

### **THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

#### **Information for authors**

Prior to publication in *B.A.S. British and American Studies*, all articles submitted are peer reviewed by two specialists in the field, according to the basic criteria listed in the *Peer review form*. Authors are advised to check whether their articles meet these basic criteria before submitting their contributions.

Once received by the editors, articles are assigned to the appropriate reviewers who, after carefully reading them, send their assessment materials to the editors. Authors are informed by the editors about the result of the peer reviewing process and, if necessary, they may be asked to operate changes in their initial manuscripts. Authors may be asked to return their revised manuscripts to the editors, after which a new round of assessment might be called for.

In case authors do not agree with the reviewers' comments and suggestions for changes, they should respond to the reviewers' directly (if the reviewers accept that their identity ~~to~~ be disclosed to the authors) or via the editors (if the reviewers do not accept that their identity ~~to~~ be disclosed to the authors). All disagreements should be settled before the deadline set by the editors for the submission of the final version of the manuscripts. In case agreement is not reached before this deadline, the articles in question will not be published.

#### **Information for reviewers**

Reviewers are kindly asked to use the *Peer review form* to evaluate the articles assigned to them. In case they need to make comments other than those included in the *Peer review form*, they can insert them in the articles proper (use the *Insert comment* command for this). The *Peer review form* and the articles with inserted comments (as the case may be) should be returned to the editors within 4-6 weeks after their reception by the reviewers, with a clear recommendation for publication, publication pending changes or rejection. If the two initial reviewers do not reach an agreement as to the publication or rejection of the article they have reviewed, the opinion of a third reviewer may be asked for.

Should reviewers be informed either directly or via the editors that authors do not agree with their comments and suggestions for change, they are asked to cooperate with the parties involved to reach an agreement so that the final versions of the manuscripts can be submitted before the deadline set by the editors. In case agreement is not reached before this deadline, the articles in question will not be published.

During the peer reviewing process, reviewers should observe the requirements contained in the *COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers*. Reviewers should inform the editors in writing on any reasons why they may not be able to comply with these requirements. Depending on the nature of non-compliance with the COPE requirements, the editors may decide to assign a particular article to a different reviewer.

Reviewers should inform the editors on whether they agree on the disclosure of their identity to the authors or not.

The final versions of the articles are sent to the authors for double checking before they go into print. Authors should return them by the deadline set by the editors.