

## **Guidelines for publications arising from symposia or similar academic events at the Academy**

In the organization of symposia and similar events at the Academy it is important from the beginning to consider whether part of the plan is to publish the proceedings in the academic series of publications issued by the Academy (<https://www.royalacademy.dk/en/Publikationer/Om-Forlaget/forlag-intro>). This should be part of the initial negotiation with or applications to the Academy. If publication of proceedings is an ambition, it is important to know the procedures that the Academy follows to ensure intellectual quality and to consult with the Editor of the Academy (AE) before the symposium/event is publicly announced. There may be variations between disciplines, but the following should be common for all relevant fields, and if adjustments and exceptions are necessary, the AE will deal with them.

All publications are subject to independent blind peer review prior to acceptance or rejection. It is up to the editor(s) to secure two such reviews of each contribution to a volume, making the reviews double blind (i.e., author and reviewer remain mutually anonymous). In addition, the editor(s) in consultation with the AE should secure a single reviewer of the volume as a whole to assess adequate thematic coherence.

It is expected that at least one of the two reviewers for each contribution (paper, report, etc.) is *not* an ordinary member of the Academy, and editors are strongly encouraged to invite foreign members to act as referees when possible. When this expectation cannot be met, the editor should consult the AE.

Editor(s) should request reviewers to follow the guidelines on the following pages. In asking for a review, it is necessary to give the reviewer a general idea of the volume in which the work under consideration is to appear, preferably in the form of a preliminary or final preface to the volume, possibly also in the shape of a programme of the event.

In most cases reviewers' reports will be written in English, but for subjects closely tied to another linguistic culture (typically but not necessarily, Scandinavian, German or French) there may be good reasons for accepting reports in the relevant language. The editor(s) should confer with the AE about such cases.

It is the responsibility of the editor(s) to ensure that all issues of copyrights, acknowledgements and permissions to reproduce are settled by the contributors, and the editor(s) should ensure that this has been done. The extent and cost of special features, especially illustrations, must be agreed to by the AE.

To be accepted for publication by the Academy, the reviewers' reports must be satisfactory to the AE. Unsatisfactory contributions must be redrafted according to the reviewers' recommendations. In case of controversial or conflicting reports the AE in consultation with the editor(s) will seek advice of relevant specialists within or outside the Academy.

## REVIEWS OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLECTIVE VOLUMES

The following points should be considered when assessing the work. It is not necessary to address all questions if they are not relevant, nor are you restricted to address only the matters listed here. The report is meant to advise the editor(s) and to help the author improve the work, and any other comments to that effect from the reviewers are highly appreciated.

The review process is double-blind. If you nevertheless recognize the author, please consider whether you are independent in your judgment, and under all circumstances refer only to 'the Author', not the name. Vice versa, you should restrict the number of references to your own research.

Also please return your report in editable form (preferably in WORD). The editors will make sure that the file is anonymized before sharing it with the author(s). The Academy publishes a list of all reviewers of publications in its annual report but only after publication of the work has been decided and without identification of the reviews done. If you nevertheless do not wish to be listed, please advise the editor of the volume.

### FOR REVIEWERS OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Please answer as many of the following questions as you deem relevant to the work under consideration, keeping in mind the volume to which it contributes (the relevance and internal coherence of the symposium volume is also to be evaluated individually; see end of this text).

1. Does the individual contribution seem to fit the entire publication?
2. Is the individual contribution a solid, academic work, properly documented, aware of and interacting with recent scholarship, showing detailed knowledge of primary sources and demonstrating mastery of the subject?
3. Does the work make an original contribution, e.g., argue a new thesis, demonstrate a new approach, present important, newly discovered or observed data, or present a valuable synthesis of other research?
4. Is the work self-contained, representing an appropriate 'unit of publication', is it well-argued, and does it include or refer to other results relevant to the hypothesis or research questions?
5. In disciplines where relevant: Does the work use correct field-specific terminology and nomenclature, in full agreement with international conventions? If deviating terminology or nomenclatural novelties are introduced, that should be specified.
6. In disciplines where relevant: If the work is based on experiments or field observations, these must have been conducted rigorously and in agreement with the standards accepted within the specific field of research. Methods should be described with sufficient information to be reproducible by another investigator.
7. In disciplines where relevant: If the work builds on sets of data, these should as far as possible be provided, published elsewhere or otherwise be or have been made available. The conclusions based

on these data sets should be robust, controlled and statistically sound. For models, to what extent is the goodness of fit stated?

8. Are all relevant sources adequately cited, quoted or paraphrased as appropriate? How does the work compare to other, especially recent, publications?

9. All figures (photographs, diagrams, maps, etc.) and tables should be relevant to the content of the article, and all figures and tables should be appropriately described in the legends, labeled and referred to in the text.

10. Is the work offensive or libelous? Does it rely on sarcasm? Is there suspicion of plagiarism?

PLEASE RECOMMEND ONE OF THESE:

A. Accept, no corrections necessary

B. Accept, pending specified revision

C. Reject the contribution as is, but resubmission possible after thorough revision

D. Reject the contribution

### **REVIEWS OF COLLECTIVE VOLUMES**

1. Please evaluate the thematic coherence of the volume. Are any contributions irrelevant or too marginal? Are obvious subjects missing?

2. Is the coverage of the volume in relation to the its theme explained in the preface to the volume? If subjects highly relevant to the theme are missing, then this should be specified and the reason(s) explained in the preface (for example, sufficient contributions could not be provided, full coverage of all subjects would not be possible within the size and/or scope of the volume, etc.)

3. Do the individual contributions, where relevant adequately refer to the general introduction and to other contributions?