Secrecy and Society Peer Review Guidelines

Articles submitted to *Secrecy and Society* may undergo two types of review: one is double blind review where the reviewer does not know who the author is, and vice versa. Only select editors are aware of the author and reviewer pre-publication.

The second type of review is direct and transparent. Referee reports are generated where reviewers waive their anonymity and volunteer to unmask their identity and correspond directly with the author on their submission (Martin 2008).

Each manuscript in the initial and final submission phases will be reviewed by up to three reviewers. Reviewers will complete a review that follows guidelines as outlined below.

Initial Considerations
- Does the article match your area of expertise?
- Do you have a potential conflict of interest?
- Do you have the time? In the event that a reviewer finds it is not possible to complete a review of the manuscript within the stipulated time (typically 14-21 days), notify the managing editor so the manuscript can be sent to another reviewer.

The Peer Review Process[1]
- If the manuscript is accepted for review, it must be treated confidentially. That is, materials and comments cannot be shared without permission from the author and managing editor.
- Comments should be collegial, constructive, and specific in terms of strengths and weaknesses of the material.
- Offer main impressions of the material, including its relevancy to *Secrecy and Society's* mission and scope. Also address whether the manuscript advances and contributes to research on secrecy and/or secrecy studies.
- Provide specific comments, suggestions, and recommendations to an author, including on the title, abstract, and keywords as reflections of the contents.
- Comments might also be offered on the author's engagement with existing scholarship, supporting evidence, method(s), language, conclusion, and references (e.g., if referring to a specific reference in the review, offer details with full citation).
- Additional elements of the review include comments addressing grammar, style, formatting, and organizational issues.
- In sum, there are "two rules for writing a helpful report: say what's good

---

1 Adapted from Elsevier (2017), PloS (n.d.), Taylor and Francis (2017), Wiley (n.d.).

about a piece of work and tell the author how to improve it" (Martin 2008).

Ethical Issues
- If you suspect plagiarism or other ethical concerns (e.g., information from a previous publication reused without proper referencing, conflicts of interest or funding), raise your concerns with the managing editor.
- *Secrecy and Society* adheres to the Committee on Publishing Ethics (COPE) *Principles of Transparency* and *Ethical Guidelines.*

Recommendations for Publication
The Scholarworks platform registers review decisions in the following way:

- Accept this article with minor or no revisions needed as described in my report ~ The paper is suitable for publication in its current form.

  If the paper is recommended for *minor revision*, this equates to light revisions. Note the recommended revisions to the author in the reviewer report. If a paper is accepted with minor revisions, no formal review is necessary, but the paper will undergo one last read by an original reviewer after the final (minor/no) revisions are complete.

- Major revisions required as described in my report ~ The paper will benefit from substantial changes such as adding specific research, organizational headings, or rewriting sections. In the reviewer report, include specific suggestions and revisions to the author.

  If a paper is categorized as "major revisions," authors will resubmit their work for additional review. Authors will submit a list of changes and comments for reviewers.

- Reject this article without the option to resubmit ~ In your review, provide specific details as to why the manuscript is not ready for publication or not a good fit with *S&S.*

- If a paper receives a mixed review (Major/Minor, Minor/Reject, or a Major/Reject), a new review will be conducted. Reviewers will consist of one of the original reviewers with the addition of a new reviewer.

Appeals
Authors may submit a formal appeal for rejected submissions. Appeal requests must be made in writing and sent to the managing editor. Authors must provide detailed reasons for the appeal and point-by-point responses to the reviewers'

and/or editor's review.

Post-publication

All authors have a responsibility to report errors and inaccuracies in published manuscripts to the managing editor. The managing editor will publicize amendments and retraction(s).

References

Committee on Publication Ethics. 2013. *COPE ethical guidelines for peer reviewers*. https://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_guidelines_for_peer_reviewers_0.pdf

____. n.d. *What to consider when asked to peer review a manuscript.* Accessed October 6, 2017. https://publicationethics.org/files/What-to-consider-when-asked-to-PR.pdf

Elsevier. 2017. *How to conduct a review*. https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/how-to-conduct-a-review

Martin, Brian. 2008. Writing a helpful referee's report. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 39, no. 3: 301-306. http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/08jspwhrr.html

PloS. n.d. *Editorial and peer review process.* Accessed October 5, 2017. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/editorial-and-peer-review-process

Taylor and Francis. 2017. *Reviewer guidelines and best practice.* June 22. http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/reviewers-guidelines-and-best-practice/

Wiley. n.d. *How to perform a peer review.* Accessed October 5, 2017. https://authorservices.wiley.com/Reviewers/journal-reviewers/how-to-perform-a-peer-review/index.html