

Polari Journal Peer Review Guidelines

Polari's Peer Review Philosophy

Polari Journal sees the peer review process as a means by which submitting authors can receive mentor-style feedback from established writers and scholars.

The process is in place to ensure quality of the work in the journal as well as provide beneficial critique of work submitted for publication. Polari Journal does not see the peer review process as a tool for excluding work based on value judgements and/or aesthetic bias.

Double Blind Process

All submissions are 'double blind reviewed' and assessed by experts in the appropriate genres/forms. Experts are scholars in the field of Creative Writing or published writers (or both).

In *Polari's* double-blind review system, writers are required to remove from their work any indication that might identify them as the creators of any work being reviewed. The anonymity of reviewers is also preserved. Authors/contributors and reviewers' identities will not be disclosed to either party.

Reviewers must not disclose to any party, especially the submission author, that they were involved in the review process of any specific work.

Polari Journal's Managing Editor or support staff will allocate each reviewer an ID number for each submission round. Likewise, each submission author will be allocated an ID number. These numbers will be used to identify submissions and reviewers during the review process. Reviewers are asked not to disclose their Reviewer ID to any party.

The submission and a Peer Review Proforma will be emailed to the reviewer. An example of the Proforma is at the end of this document. The Proforma will already include the submission title and the author and reviewer ID numbers.

Each submission is reviewed twice. In a situation where one reviewer suggests publication whilst another reviewer rejects a submission, a third reviewer will be assigned. The third reviewer will receive both of the completed Peer Review Proformas and make a final decision.

Standard Criteria

The review is undertaken using standard criteria. This removes most of the main problems sometimes associated with peer review – conflict of interest, aesthetic and/or discipline related bias, professional or creative jealousy etc. Apart from the standard criteria, reviewers are encouraged to provide a few paragraphs of feedback to submission author/s to assist them to refine their work. This feedback should be based on the criteria, and should be written in a way that provides mentor-style advice about the work to the submission author. The goal is to provide the author with enough feedback to facilitate their growth as a writer/scholar.

Confidentiality

All reviews are undertaken in confidence. Respect for the privacy of the submission authors' work and intellectual/creative property is important. All submissions and related materials are privileged communications that cannot be shown to or discussed with other individuals.

By agreeing to undertake the review/assessment, the reviewer agrees that he/she fully understands the confidential nature of the review process and agrees to confidentiality and non-disclosure.

Reviewers are required to delete all review and submission materials at the conclusion of the review process. You will be notified by the Managing Editor of Polari Journal when the process is complete.

Timeliness

It is expected that reviews will be undertaken in a timely fashion. Generally speaking, reviews should be completed within six weeks of receipt of the work by the reviewer.

Reviewers/Editors Submission Process

Polari Journal encourages its peer reviewers and editors to submit their own creative and scholarly work. In the situation where a reviewer submits work it will undergo the same peer review process. Reviewers are also encouraged to suggest authors/scholars for inclusion in the Showcase section. Between 3 and 4 items will be included in the Showcase each issue (including 1 interview). The final decision as to what is included in the Showcase section will be made in consultation with relevant editorial collective members/reviewers. From time to time, Polari Journal's Managing Editor will also invite peer reviewers, editors and past contributors to submit work for inclusion in the Showcase section.

Return of Review Proforma

Peer reviews will be returned by email to: editor@polarijournal.com with 'Completed Proforma' in the subject field.

An example peer review Proforma follows overleaf.

Polari Journal Peer Review Proforma

Submission Title:	
Issue #:	2
Author ID #:	
Reviewer ID#:	

Instructions: Copy and paste a tick or cross in the appropriate columns below. Where a cross has been entered in the NO column, one of the following comments must be entered in the COMMENT column:

✓

✗

Minor revision required

Substantial revision required

Exhaustive revision required

General Criteria (Creative AND Scholarly)			
	YES	NO	COMMENT
1. Engaging writing style			
2. Well structured/organised			
3. Clarity of expression			
4. Absence of syntactic or typographical errors			
5. Displays innovation and/or creativity			

All submissions must receive a YES in each of these categories to be accepted for publication without revision.

Creative Criteria

	YES	NO	COMMENT
1. Point of view			
2. Dialogue			
3. Description			
4. Plot			
5. Theme			
6. Narrative flow and pace			
7. Characters			
8. Voice			
9. Understanding of genre			
10. Appropriate for intended audience			

Tick yes if these aspects are strongly developed. All submissions must receive a YES in each of these categories to be accepted for publication without revision.

Scholarly Criteria

	YES	NO	COMMENT
1. Evidence of in-depth research			
2. Research utilised effectively			
3. Demonstrated knowledge of the field			
4. Articulate academic language			
5. Consistent citation style			
6. Majority of citations are current (>10 years)			
7. Title and abstract adequately reflect content			
8. Purpose/aims of research stated well			
9. Relationship to other research in the subject or discipline clearly expressed			
10. Significant contribution to the development of the subject/discipline			

All submissions must receive a YES in each of these categories to be accepted for publication without revision.

Recommendations	
	✓
Accept for immediate publication	
Accept with minor revisions	
Decline with encouragement to substantially revise and resubmit for future issues	
Decline and suggest exhaustive revision	

***If revisions have been suggested:** Please provide a few paragraphs of feedback, referring to the criteria above, to assist the author/s to refine their work.*

Feedback