



Peer Review Statement ZfE/JSCA Zeitschrift für Ethnologie/Journal of Social and Cultural Anthropology

The ZfE/JSCA follows a strict peer review process.

Submitted articles will first be reviewed by the editors/the editorial team. At this stage, articles which do not conform to the disciplinary, academic, and formal standards of the journal will be rejected and the authors will be informed about this decision within 4-6 weeks.

Those articles that pass this first review process will proceed to a peer review (double blind), from at least two peer reviewers. To make this peer review process transparent and comprehensible, the reviewers are asked to follow a catalogue of questions and to come up with a suggestion (see below). After receiving the two peer reviews, the editors will evaluate these and discuss the further procedure. In case of a grave dissonance between the two reviews or other issues that require further evaluation, the editors might obtain a third peer review.

Based on these peer reviews the editors will formulate one of the following outcomes: - Acceptance without revision; - Acceptance possible after slight revision; - Acceptance possible after extended revision; - Rejection – and inform the authors about it together with the crucial information from the peer reviews. This peer review process will generally take between 6-8 weeks, if a third peer review is obtained the review process might take up to 12 weeks or sometimes even longer, depending on the availability of the reviewers.

All manuscripts are peer-reviewed according to the following criteria:

1. Content criteria
 - a. Argumentation and structure of the manuscript:
 - Are the arguments, lines of argumentation and conclusions based on the (empirical) material presented clearly, convincingly, stringently, and coherently regarding content and structure of the text?
 - If the manuscript is based on empirical research: Is the state of research, the context and the methodological approach sufficiently presented and reflected?
 - Are the chosen theoretical approaches and the presentation of empirical materials brought into a productive dialogue with each other?
 - Is the handling of scientific concepts sufficiently reflected in the theoretical analysis?
 - Is the author's own positionality sufficiently reflected methodologically and theoretically?
 - Is the analysis sufficiently profound and far-reaching?



b. Scientific relevance and originality of the manuscript:

- Is it an original text? Are there new and interesting results that complement and advance the previous debates in Social/Cultural Anthropology?
- What is the added value, innovative power and (scientific and possibly also non-scientific) relevance of the text?

2. Formal and linguistic criteria

- Orthography, grammar, sentence structure, style.
- Are all formalities of the ZfE/JSCA (citation method, formatting, text length) correctly observed?
- Is the manuscript characterised by terminological and linguistic precision?
- Does the text reveal an awareness of the importance of linguistic means for communicating scientific knowledge?

Once authors resubmit their articles the editors will check whether the articles have been re-edited along the critique from the peer reviews. In case of doubt, the peer reviewers might be asked to re-evaluate the re-submitted articles.

If the articles have taken in the peer reviews in a satisfying way, they will be accepted. If the revision has not sufficiently addressed the peer review critique, the editors will, based on the potential of the revised article, decide whether to ask the authors for another round of revisions. Once the editors agree that the article has addressed the critique of the peer reviews in a sufficient way and further fulfils the general quality standard of the journal, the article will be accepted.