

9/19/2014

CD+S ONLINE REVIEW GUIDELINES

CD+S Online is written in a style that is accessible and engaging and that minimizes academic jargon. Articles are rigorously researched and analyzed so that publication is one that scholars are pleased to include on their publications list. Generally speaking, we do not accept opinion pieces, which are normally more appropriate for an editorial page. When reviewing articles for publication, we ask reviewers to consider the following points:

1. Quality of the piece

- Does the submission engage in critical and analytical work or does it represent well-documented source material of a song or dance tradition that will be of value to future researchers?
- Does the content meet a high standard in terms of the quality, breadth and depth of research? Are the arguments supported by the research and is the research replicable?
- Would the submission require a substantial amount of editing/reworking on our part? Is it engaging and accessible?

2. Fit for the journal

- Does the content fit with our mission to explore music, song, and dance rooted in England and North America?
- Would the submission work in terms of formatting/layout? (For example, we do not want a link to a 30-minute YouTube video in which the specific material the reader is supposed to view is buried deeply; we prefer snippets.)
- Does it come with practical, usable media or media ideas?

3. Originality

- Has this submission been published elsewhere? If so, we cannot accept it for publication in CD+S Online.
- Do the arguments seem fresh or have you heard them before?

4. Permissions

- Is the content usable or does it require extensive, expensive, or impossible permissions issues?

Decision-Making

Reviewers are asked to give one of the following four opinions on the submission:

1. Accept as is.
2. Accept with revisions (in this case, please indicate ideas, paragraphs or sentences that need work).
3. Revise and resubmit for review (in this case, please indicate areas or sentences that need work; this would be an extensive rewrite and the results would be submitted to the original reader as well as to a second reader).
4. Reject. Please provide some concrete reasoning as to why it should be rejected based on the criteria above.

A reviewer may also request that another or an additional reader(s) review the submission.

Note that the General Editor, in consultation with CDSS staff, retains final decision-making authority.