



UNIVERSITY OF  
**LEICESTER**



## Peer Review

*Museum and Society* follows a double-blind peer review process.

Each submission is assigned by the Production Editor to a member of the Editorial Board. That editor is responsible for locating three appropriate peer reviewers for each article, based on the latter's experience and areas of expertise. In extraordinary cases, authors may ask to exclude ONE possible reviewer. This request may be made in the notes accompanying submissions. No reasons need to or should be given.

Peer reviewers have approximately one month in which to respond; in some cases, the response period may be extended due to circumstances beyond reviewers' control. Once the editor handling an article has received all three reviews, that editor will make their decision based on reviewers' recommendations. This decision about publication will be conveyed to the author. Ordinarily, reviewers' full comments are forwarded to authors; however, the editor may withhold them under certain circumstances, for instance, when the comments are inappropriate or breach confidentiality, or when the reviewer has requested that they not be shared.

In cases where a revision is requested, authors will normally have a month in which to make moderate changes; six months will be allotted for major revision of a submission. This revision period may be extended upon written request setting out any circumstances beyond the author's control. Authors who take longer to make revisions without an approved request for an extension may find their works treated as new

submissions, with new editors and reviewers assigned to them. When submitting revised articles, authors are strongly encouraged to include a summary of changes, with an explanation of what was done (or not done). Revised articles may be sent out for additional review based on the recommendations of the original reviewers and the scope of the revisions. In cases where only minimal changes are necessary, a revision will not go out for another round of reviews.

Requests for revision and rejections are part of the scholarly review process. Authors should understand that pieces may not be accepted for a variety of reasons, some of which have little to do with the quality of their work, as when a piece does not fall within the scope of our journal. Appeals against an editor's decision should only be made after serious reflection. In such cases, authors should write to the Chair of the Editorial board a brief letter explaining why they are appealing the decision.