**Guide for editors. *Peripeti* 2024.**

**Organization**

The editorial board ( EB) is co-opting and consists of a group of researchers and other professionals within the field of the journal . Since the primary activity of the journal is research publication, the majority of the group are researchers affiliated with the institutions Aarhus University (Dramaturgy), University of Copenhagen (Theatre and Performance S tudies) and The Danish National School of Performing Arts. The editorial board meets approximately twice a year to discuss themes and content for current and future issues, finances, editorial policies, and projects related to the journal, such as digitization, PR, seminars, etc. The editorial board elects an editor-in-chief who has the overall responsibility for the journal ’s work and who chairs the editorial board meetings. The general running of the journal is managed by an executive committee of three people, including the editor-in-chief. The editorial board coincides with the members of Peripeti, and the executive committee coincides with the board of the association Peripeti.

**Editorial teams**

The editorial work for each issue is handled by a specialised team of editors . The editorial team (ET) typically consists of 3-6 editors. At least one editor of the team must be a member of the editorial board to ensure communication and adequate knowledge of the journal ’s procedures and standards. At least one team member – preferably more – should have research qualifications (PhD degree or equivalent) to ensure the quality of the peer review process. The editorial board or editorial team selects a coordinator ( C) who provides the overall process overview and coordination between relevant partners from the first meeting until the issue is published and distributed to relevant contributors.

**Process**

The editorial process for a single issue typically takes between 1-1.5 years and consists of the following five main stages:

1) Definition of topic, establishing the editorial team and identifying contributors.

2) Writing phase.

3) Peer review and revision phase.

4) Finalizing phase – including copy-editing, proofreading, layout, finalizing editorial content, publication .

5) Distribution phase – including circulation to contributors, possible launch or other PR activities, evaluation and financial reporting.

The following is a review of tasks and responsibilities for the five phases. A default timeline is then outlined.

***1) Initial phase: defining the topic,***  ***establishing a theme editorial team and identifying contributors.***

The process usually starts with the editorial board ( EB) deciding on a theme for an issue and setting up an editorial team ( ET) with a coordinator ( C). The theme editorial team may be supplemented with guest editors.

* C convenes the members of the ET for an initial meeting during which the theme is specified, potential contributors are identified and initiatives for special content (e.g. surveys, interviews, translations, etc.) are discussed. In addition, the TET creates a process plan and reviews the budget for the issue. The copy-editor attends this meeting to agree on the final process (phase 4).
* The editorials team writes and issues a Call for Papers (CfP). In addition to specifying the topic, the CfP must contain the relevant deadlines for the process and information about formats and procedures. See examples from previous years at the journals website. The CfP is published on both websites and sent to EB, who helps disseminate to relevant networks.
* In addition to the open CfP, ET can also invite contributors directly and initiate articles themselves. (Note Publication Ethics regarding “Conflict of interest ” and “endogeny ”).
* ET reviews all article proposals received as soon as possible after the deadline, collectively selects the best ones in terms of theme, quality and composition of the issue. Response to the authors should be sent no later than three weeks after the proposals have been received. It is advisable to accept slightly more articles than the standards of the section policy (see below), as there are almost always cancellations along the way.
* The ET distributes responsibility for the articles among themselves so that everyone in the ET is an article editor (A E) on a manageable number of articles.

***2) Writing phase***

* AE (i.e. the individual article editors) contacts the contributors, ensure that they receive the submission guidelines and make agreements on compliance with deadlines, etc.
* ET initiates or prepares any specially agreed content, e.g. interviews, reprints, translations, surveys, etc.
* It is recommended to work with the same deadline for research articles and other articles. Research articles typically have a longer editorial process after the first draft than other articles, but bottlenecks in the finalizing step of the process can be avoided by having the other articles dispatched for proofreading and layout before the research articles as far as possible. Special agreements on deadlines can be made as needed if there is flexibility in the schedule.

***3) Peer review and revision phase***

* After the deadline for the first draft, ET meets to take stock of incoming articles, and coordinates how the research articles are sent for peer review.
* There is often too much material for the entire ET to read everything in each round. The ET coordinates when there is a need for several editors to read through some of the material before responding to the author.
* *For research articles:*
  + ET discusses whether each article is ready to be sent for peer review.
    - If ET assesses that the article appears incomplete or is unlikely to pass peer review (grade D), it is recommended that the author is given a short-term opportunity to revise the article based on the editor ’s comments *before* submitting it for review.
    - If ET assesses that the article is likely to pass review

(grades A, B, C), possibly with remarks, ET agrees on possible reviewers for the article, which AE contacts in order of priority. See Publication Ethics for qualification and impartiality requirements. In this case, editorial comments on the article are saved for the revision that will takes place after peer review, so they can be included in the same workflow by the author.

* + AE ensures that the articles are anonymised and makes agreements with the relevant reviewers, including sending out guidelines and agreeing on deadlines before sending the article for review. Abstract may be sent to the reviewer in connection with enquiry in order to clarify academic match. The author is informed about the further process.
  + After receiving the written review, AE communicates with the author about the revision and deadline for the further process.
    - If the article has been rated A, B or C (approved with no, minor or major revisions): the unedited, anonymised review is generally sent to the author. AE adds their/the editorial team’s recommendations and requirements for the review, including, if necessary, interpretations of requirements and prioritisations of recommendations included in the peer review. See Publication Ethics on transparency.
    - If the article is rated D, the article is rejected. The ET assesses whether the author should be offered an opportunity to resubmit – either for a new peer review or in an essay format. Both options should only be used if the ET believes there is a particularly good reason for it and if the schedule allows it.
  + AE checks that later versions fulfil the requirements set by the reviewer and ET. The article is not sent back to the reviewer. The editorial team – possibly in consultation with the editor-in-chief – has the responsibility to judge when the article is ready for publication, taking into account the requirements of both the reviewer and the editorial team.
  + Remember to ask the author to make adjustments according to the submission guidelines if this is not already in place. AE will not send the article to copy-editing etc. until the author has made basic adjustments to the submission guidelines in terms of length, typography, reference practices, including ensuring that all elements are provided , including *abstract, author bio, images in the correct resolution, captions, documentation of image rights.*
* *For other articles:*
  + AE decides with the other members of TET if there is a need for sparring in relation to the revision .
  + AE communicates requirements and recommendations for revision to the author and agrees on a deadline for submission. Remember to ask the author to make adjustments according to the submission guidelines if this is not already taken care of (see above).
  + When AE assesses that the article – possibly in a revised form – is ready for the final process, it is sent for proofing/copy-editing as soon as possible – or as agreed with the copy-editor at the initial meeting.
* C creates an overview document of the various articles and their status. C continuously coordinates with the rest of ET to support that the processes are progressing as planned and that AE gets feedback as needed. ET involves the editor-in-chief as needed.

**4) *Finalizing phase: from copy-editing to publishing***

* ET sets an internal deadline for when all material must be ready for copy-editing/proofreading. Copy-editing is an extended proofreading that does not address the academic content of the article, but includes suggestions for linguistic improvements, checks correspondence between references and bibliography, and checks that the article follows the writing guidelines. (It is assumed that AE has ensured that the authors have followed the writing guidelines from the start). By agreement with the copy-editor, the material can be sent continuously to avoid a bottleneck.
* This last phase requires a great deal of coordination and correspondence by ET, as the authors must first approve copy-editing/proofreading and then layout, and it can delay the process greatly if there are too many intermediaries in the correspondence. To the extent that it is financially possible for the individual issue, the copy editor (CE) takes over the correspondence with the authors and the layout designer when AE has forwarded the article to CE. CE involves AE when relevant. CE and C keep in touch during the final phase to maintain an overview of the process. If there is not enough funding for CE, ET agrees how coordination and correspondence will be handled.
* CE performs copy-editing/proofreading of the individual articles and sends suggestions/corrections for the author ’s approval. If there are any doubts or disagreements, AE and possibly C are involved.
* CE forwards the articles to layout when the author has approved corrections. Layouter returns the set-up article to CE.
* CE skims the layout of the articles (focus on typography, placement of images, indentation of quotes, bullet points, correctness of headings, etc.) and sends for approval by the author. ( C is involved as needed). If there are major errors, they are corrected before the article is sent to the author, otherwise the author can add their corrections to the CEs in the PDF. *The author is reminded that*  *this phase*  *is only layout proofreading. General proofreading belongs in the earlier phase. Other errors are only corrected at this stage if they are significant, such as factual errors, incorrect spelling*  *of names or headings, but not comma errors and general proofreading*.
* The ET finalises the foreword. The foreword should include a brief introduction to the topic (possibly based on CfP) and a short description of the individual articles.
* ET determines the order of the articles and ensures that the layouter has sufficient information and material regarding colophon, table of contents, English summaries and cover – including image and back cover text to finalise the issue.
* *Publishing the online version*
  + Layouter uploads the approved articles to open journal systems and reports ready to C.
  + C checks that the finished issue contains the correct elements, including metadata (keywords, abstracts) for each article, cover and back cover text, colophon, summaries and that the table of contents is correct.
  + C publishes online or asks layout er to do so.
* *Publishing the printed version*
  + C makes an agreement with the printer about print runs, deadlines, price, delivery, etc. Note: *Peripeti* uses sustainability-certified printing (additional cost).
  + C receives a complete pdf of the entire issue for the final layout correction. C prints the issue and runs through all pages in print. Pay particular attention to blank pages, page breaks, line spacing, fonts and font sizes, indentation of quotes, indentation of paragraphs, errors in headings, errors on the cover, missing captions, incorrect spelling in names and headings, errors in page headers, etc.) Highlight in the text, scan and send to the layout designer with corrections and page numbers in the follow-up email.
  + C receives the corrected pdf from the layout designer and sends it to the printer.
  + C receives/collects the printed issue .

***5) Distribution phase, including launch and reporting***

* ET makes a mailing list of the people who have been involved in the issue and who should receive a printed copy of *Peripeti* (authors, peer reviewers, guest editors, possibly other contributors). The list is sent to the editor-in-chief, who ensures that the issue is sent out – typically via a student assistant, also to the permanent list of editors and *Peripeti* ’s collaborators.
* ET may write press releases and other PR material, which is submitted to the editor-in-chief.
* ET may organise a launch event if finances allow.
* ET ensures (in dialogue with the treasurer and/or grant holder) that fees are paid to layouts, copy-editor and any artistic contributions (translation, image rights, etc.). The treasurer/grant holder takes care of salary reporting for tax purposes.
* C/ ET makes sure to create an account of expenses for the issue (including copyediting, layout, printing, rights, artist fees, launch), stating which grants the various expenses are covered by. Involve the treasurer and grant holder as needed. The accounts are sent to the treasurer and editor-in-chief.
* The editor-in-chief ensures that the issue is evaluated at the following editorial meeting (process and content).

***Example of process plan***

*1) Initial phase*

First editorial meeting Early October 2024

Publication of CfP Mid November 2024

Deadline for article proposals Mid January 2025

Feedback to authors Early February 2025

*2) Writing phase*

Submission deadline (1st version) Early May 2025

*3) Peer review and revision phase*

ET reviews, possible revision May 2025

Peer review May-June 2025 (before summer holidays)

**(**July - August, summer holidays)

Revisions after peer review August - September 2025

*4) Finalizing phase*

Proofreading and copy-editing September - October 2025

Layout and layout correction October - November 2025

Send to printer/upload to OJS Mid November 2025

Planned publication Early December 2025

*5) Distribution phase*

Payroll settlement Early December 2025 (or earlier)

Send to contributors Early December 2025

Launch Mid December 2025

Accounting and evaluation January 2026

Be aware that many steps in the process can be delayed due to time spent on correspondence (e.g. the first peer reviewer you ask may accept or and/or may not respond immediately). Many people involved have other jobs, which also makes it necessary to add a buffer time to both correspondence and processes. The timeline here is fairly realistic and based on previous processes, but it still requires tight management.

**Section policy**

A regular issue of *Peripeti* contains the following elements:

* Cover: image and back cover text (which works as a brief abstract online)
* Title page/theme statement
* Colophon page
* Table of contents
* Editorial foreword
* A section with peer-reviewed articles (indicative number 4-6)
* Sections with other articles including e.g. essays, interviews, surveys and reviews (recommended 5-8 units)
* English summaries (as a minimum of all research articles)

Indicative length: 120-140 pages. For reasons of economy, workload and readability, ET is encouraged not to exceed this volume limit. At least half of the pages should be peer-reviewed research articles.

The ET can choose to place the articles in a sequence that deviates from the section division above and mix the genres, e.g. according to a thematic logic, but it must be clear which articles are peer-reviewed.

**Special**  **issues**

The editorial board may decide to publish special issues, for example as a result of a scientifically relevant research projects or on the basis of a particularly topical subject (e.g. an anniversary). ET for a special issue cannot consist solely of guest editors, i.e. a permanent member of *Peripeti* ’s editorial board must be included in ET as a coordinator to ensure that the journal ’s standards and procedures are followed. The framework, the distribution of responsibilities and procedures are basically the same as above, with a few specific exceptions:

* ET can choose to create a purely curated issue without using CfP.
* ET can deviate from the scope and section policy. However, the format must still be a journal issue consisting of articles and not, for example, a monograph.

The editorial team welcomes proposals for special issues with a brief abstract describing the theme, an outline of the content, a timetable, a list of partners and a budget. The editors will evaluate the proposals both in terms of whether their content fits the purpose of the journal and whether the project has a realistic budget in terms of money and editorial resources (labour and qualifications).