

Peer-Review Form (MIP, ARC, and AUP Publishers) for Medieval Studies, Global History, and European History

Thank you for agreeing to undertake a review for us. We are naturally indebted to the expertise of scholars in the field to undertake evaluation of manuscripts submitted to us for publication. Peer-reviewers are the guardians of the scrutiny process to ensure that only sound scholarship is published and that our presses publish reputable work befitting all of us.

Before starting your review, please observe carefully the following guidelines on the role of the referee.

1. Confidentiality

Referees receive unpublished work, which must be treated as confidential until published. They should destroy all electronic and printed copies of the draft manuscript and referee report once they have received confirmation that their reports have been received by the publisher (in case we can't open the report files you send us). Referees must not disclose to others which books they have refereed; nor are they to share those manuscripts with any other person.

2. Expertise

Manuscripts are not always sent to a referee whose field is identical to the subject matter of that paper. You don't have to be precisely qualified in a field to be a constructive referee. In fact, quite the contrary, an excellent book will speak beyond its defined field. If, however, a manuscript is so distant from your field that you do not feel qualified to judge its merits, please let us know, and we will locate another referee.

3. Plagiarism and Copyright

If a referee considers that a manuscript may contain plagiarism or that it might breach another party's copyright, please notify us, providing the relevant citations to support your claim.

4. Intellectual Merit

A manuscript must be judged on its intellectual merits alone.

5. Full Explanation

Critical or negative judgments must be supported by reference to evidence from the manuscript under review or other relevant sources.

6. Responsiveness

Referees are asked to return their reports within four weeks. This assists us to provide rapid feedback to the author.

Manuscript title:

Author/Editor's name:

Peer Review by:

Affiliation:

Date: 2015

Please keep in mind that we will share your comments with the author.

Indicate your preference: Include personal details Omit personal details

Part II – Detailed Report on the Work (ideally 1-3 pages in length; attach this as an additional document)

Please include specific comments about issues such as lack of clarity or illogical argumentation, errors or omissions, mistakes in citations or references:

Part II – Summary Evaluation

1. General

Overall, do you think the subject matter covered in this manuscript makes it suitable for publication with us? Is there a specific book series you feel it would be suited to?

Comments:

2. The manuscript and underlying research

Is the manuscript (and its underlying research) based on clear research objectives? Does it contain an adequate account of the methodological approach? Does it offer a consistent and logical argument?

Comments:

3. Context

Does the manuscript offer a relevant context within the scientific field? Does it indicate the (scientific or societal) relevance of the research?

Comments:

4. Originality, innovation

Does the manuscript offer new insights or concepts? Is innovative from a theoretical, methodological and empirical perspective?

Comments:

5. Coherence (especially with edited volumes)

Is there sufficient coherence between chapters? Also in terms of the theoretical framework, the presented data and the methodology that was used?

Comments:

6. Literature

Does the manuscript make adequate reference to and show good understanding of the existing literature? Is there important literature to which the manuscript does not refer?

Comments:

7. Reflection

Does the author evaluate the chosen research objectives, methodology and results? Does the manuscript demonstrate a critical self-awareness of the author's own perspectives? Does it discuss alternative or competing perspectives?

Comments:

Part III – Readership and Market

We would greatly appreciate your input as an expert in the field on these issues.

Who is the potential readership of this publication?

Tick all that apply:

- Academics in the specific research field
- A broader academic field
- Undergraduate students
- Graduate students
- Politicians and policymakers
- A broader general public
- Other:

Are the manuscript's length, the author's style and the title and subtitle appropriate for the topic and readership?

Comments:

What are the potential (inter)national markets for this publication?

Comments:

Please outline any points you may have regarding possible international sales (e.g. Relevant countries, courses, levels, needs for case studies).

Comments:

Who do you consider to be the main potential purchasers for this publication (e.g. Individual academics, individual students, central libraries, department libraries)?

Comments:

If the publication is likely to be useful for students, for which courses and at what levels?

Are you aware of any other material (forthcoming or published) that would be appropriate for the same intended purpose as this proposal? If so, please give any known details about title, author, and publisher, as well as any other comments—e.g., the material’s strengths and weaknesses.

Comments:

Part IV – Overall Recommendation:

Bearing in mind that MIP, ARC, and AUP presses aspire to high-levels of scholarly standing in these fields, please tick the relevant box below:

- The manuscript is suitable for publication, once routine editing has been completed.
- The manuscript is suitable for publication, if substantial changes are made (*please specify if flagged*).
- The manuscript is not suitable for publication, unless a thoroughly revised version is submitted for re-evaluation (*please specify if flagged*).
- The manuscript is not suitable for publication.

Comments: