

Architectural Histories - SC Editors guidelines

A Special Collection (SC) is a set of articles under the guidance of one or more editors. These are scholars who are external to the *Architectural Histories* editorial team and act as guest editors for the SC.

Architectural Histories does not advertise open calls for papers for Special Collections. Instead, Editors interested in submitting a Special Collection proposal to Architectural Histories must formally present their proposal with an email addressed to the current editor-in-chief, editor-in-chief@journal.eahn.org, and the editorial assistant, editorial@journal.eahn.org.

This email must contain a pdf attachment with the following information:

- Title of the Special Collection [SC] and full names of the SC editors.
- SC abstract one page maximum
- List of articles and authors, including a 300 words abstract for each article. The SC must be mainly composed of research articles. SC editors are expected to provide an editorial for the collection that presents its scope and gives an overview of the contents.
- Expected date for submission of completed articles.
- Publication schedule
- Available funding sources¹
- Short CV (one paragraph) of SC editors and authors.

SC proposals will be reviewed by the *Architectural Histories* Editorial Board and the editors will receive notice of their acceptance/rejection.

Once an SC is accepted, SC editors will coordinate their development and submission before the agreed deadline. They will keep AH's editor-in-chief informed of their progress and any possible eventuality. All articles must keep the Journal's quality standard and comply with all the Journal's conditions and formatting rules. For these, please consult the following guide-lines:

https://journal.eahn.org/submit/start/

https://journal.eahn.org/about/submissions/

Minor adjustments can be made to the SC authors line-up, schedule, article titles and scopes, among other details. However, such changes must be made in consultation with the editor-in-chief. This is especially the case for changing or substituting authors and articles. If SC editors

¹ Although it is not mandatory, SC Editors can use external funding to cover APCs and copyediting costs. *Architectural Histories* covers open access publishing costs (APCs) and basic copyediting expenses for 26 research articles every year, thanks to the economic support of EAHN and Open Library of Humanities. Authors are responsible to cover additional copyediting hours if needed.



desire to change significant aspects in the collection, they will be required to submit a new proposal for AH's editorial board to review.

When an SC article is submitted, SC editors will be responsible for managing the peer-review process. They will do so for each SC article separately. SC editors will suggest potential reviewers to the editor-in-chief, who will make the final decision. Once potential reviewers are selected, SC editors will contact them first personally and, if they accept, SC editors will send them an invitation through the *Architectural Histories* JMS platform.

When peer-reviewers' reports come in, SC editors will produce a brief assessment synthethising their comments and the main aspects to be changed and/or corrected. All this information will be sent to the editor-in-chief, who will notify authors of the acceptance/rejection of their articles, which changes need to be implemented, and a deadline for authors to submit the revised manuscript.

All final decisions remain on the editor-in-chief. Note: SC editors will not send any official communication to authors.

SC editors will be responsible for guiding the authors through the correction and resubmission process. If authors need clarification or further guidance, SC editors will take care of them.

Once each article has been resubmitted and accepted, it will enter the copyediting stage. SC editors will ensure that SC articles comply with AH's style guidelines before sending them to copyediting [See Annex 1 - guidelines checklist]. The copyeditor assigned by *Architectural Histories* will contact the authors and guide them through this process. SC editors will also accompany authors through the copyediting phases, supporting them when necessary and updating the editor-in-chief on any eventuality.

Once the copyediting stage is completed, articles will enter the typesetting stage. The first typeset version of the manuscript will be sent to its authors, SC editors, AH copyeditor, proof-reader, and the editorial assistant for revision. All comments and corrections will be sent to the AH copyeditor, who will communicate with the typesetting team to implement them. Once the typesetting team implements them, the article is ready for publication.

Further details of the editorial process are specified in **Annex 2**. Please, read every section carefully and consult the editor-in-chief and the editorial assistant if any doubt or question arises.

SC editors have the option of publishing SC articles as soon as they are ready, by batches, or all at the same time. Important: <u>Post-publication changes are not possible.</u>



Annex 1 - Style and format guidelines checklist for editors before sending articles to copyedit.

https://journal.eahn.org/about/submissions/#Policy%20on%20English%20Language

Although authors are supposed to follow the guidelines, they often miss some of the rules. The Editor-in-chief tries to check most format mistakes during her first reading before assigning articles to editors, but many other errors can appear during the following editorial process.

Guidelines published in the Journal are meant for pre-peer review documents. Once the manuscript is nearing its final editing phase, there are adjustments in the style guidelines:

Name and institutional affiliation in the title page.

Author's note (Acknowledgments. Optional) immediately after notes.

Statement of no competing interests, just before the references section.

Editors must ensure that their assigned articles comply with all guidelines before handing them for copyediting and typesetting. Any unnoticed error will eventually come up later during copyediting (increasing her fee), typesetting (delaying proofreading and publication), or even after publication when errors <u>can no longer be fixed</u>. All these situations end up in extra work-load for the whole team.

Structure and style checklist

Title page - Includes full title, autor name and affiliation, contact email address.

Keywords -

Abstract - It must always be an abstract. No more than 250 words. No references or notes.

List of sources -

Main text - Clear research paper structure: introduction, methods, results, discussion/conclusion. Each of them must begin with a heading, even the introduction at the start of the article. Avoid epigraphs and images before the initial heading. Sometimes authors propose to use epigraphs, but these do not really fit in the structure and tone of a research paper.

No track changes left in final version.

Figure captions - Now inserted following the first paragraph where each figure is mentioned.

Confirm figure's copyright -

Note - All notes are endnotes. There are no footnotes in Architectural Histories.

Author's note (Acknowledgments. Optional) - They must be headed and in a separate paragraph, placed after the main text but before the reference list, next to funding information, and author's contributions (if applicable).



Statement of no competing interests -

References - follow *Chicago Manual of Style 16th.* (Author, date). No footnotes but rather endnotes.

Image style and quality checklist

Appropriate dpi - at least 300dpi and no more than 20MB. In Windows, you can check this information by right-clicking on the image file, then selecting "Properties" and going to the "Details" tab. Standard formats accepted are: JPG, TIFF, GIF, PNG, EPS. For line drawings, please ask for the original vector file (e.g. .ai, or .eps).

Check for double captions. Texts inside images must use the following fonts so they match the typeset text: Arial, Helvetica, Verdana.

Ensure images are already edited and publication ready -

Captions need to be clear and edifying -



Annex 2 - Architectural Histories - Editorial Workflow

- 1. Peer review process
 - SC Editors choose reviewers and inform the Editor-in-chief so she can inform on possible incompatibilities (e.g. reviewers who have recently been rejected as authors). In case of doubt when choosing reviewers, SC editors confer with the Editor-in-chief.
 - **SC Editors** send **reviewers** an official invitation through the Journal's Management System (JMS). <u>This email must be personalized</u>. Do not use the JMS template for your first communication. Any potential reviewers receiving an invitation from AH should clearly understand that they have been handpicked for their academic excellence and expertise.
 - SC Editors have the option to send their invitation via email, depending on their preferences and their relationship with the potential reviewer. SC Editors who choose to do so must later send an official invitation via JMS so we keep register of the peer review process.
 - **Reviewers** register on the platform, login and officially accept the task. JMS provides them with an approximative deadline.
 - **Reviewers** evaluate the manuscript and send their reports. This usually takes between 2 weeks and 2 months. **SC Editor/s** must keep track and contact their reviewer, especially when the deadline is approaching.
 - Remember to keep a sympathetic conversation with **reviewers**, adapt to their circumstances and thank them when the task is completed. For the Journal to be healthy, we need to build a strong network of reviewers who may want to collaborate with us again in the future.
 - **Reviewers** provide an online report through JMS. Reviewers can upload their own report files if they prefer to do so. This is fine as long as the report is anonymized. At this point there are several possible recommendations:
 - a. Accepted without changes (never happened).
 - b. Accepted with minor changes.
 - c. Pre-accepted but major changes are needed (most common).
 - d. Rejected.
 - After receiving both **reviewer's reports, editor/s** write a summary and recommend a decision to the Editor-in-chief.
 - It is the **Editor-in-chief's** responsibility to take the final decision and communicate it to the **author**. **SC Editors** do not need to cover all the points from the reviewers (the authors will see those in their reports), but rather, they need to provide a synopsis of the main points. Many editors helpfully provide their own feedback, which is immensely appreciated by both the **authors** and **Editor-in-chief**.
 - Ultimately, it is our take to accept or reject a manuscript. If the decision is still unclear, the **editor/s** and **Editor-in-chief** can discuss the possibility of having a third reviewer.
 - **Special Collections** only require one reviewer since this kind of article already go through an extensive editorial process prior to submission.



2. Post peer review changes

- If the article is accepted, **the authors** receive the decision and a proposed deadline for submitting a revised version following reviewers' and editor/s' recommendations.
- Usually, the article comes back and forth several times between the authors and the SC editors. SC editors should contact the Editor-in-chief and Editorial assistant if any problem arises in the process, especially during the month before resubmission.
- This phase is when editors must ensure that the article complies with all style and format guidelines of Architectural Histories. To help you in this task, we have elaborated a summarized checklist [See Annex 2 - guidelines checklist]. Every unnoticed mistake or omission here imply extra work and costs in later stages of the editorial process, among other undesirable issues. Also, editors must check to make sure images are acceptable, their quality is up to AH's standards, and that copyright clearance is obtained. SC Editor/s must check if all changes are effectively applied. They should propose additional changes to make sure that the document complies with the Journal's style, structure, and format guidelines. At this stage, the article usually comes back and forth several times between the editor/s and the authors, with Chief Ed. and Assistant Ed. cc'd.
- When this revision is complete, Authors must submit their final revised manuscript through the journal system, <u>never via email</u>. This is essential. It enables us to keep an official record of the process and to avoid editors reading the wrong files, or older versions inadvertently. The "current" version must always be the version of the system. If there are old files or upload errors that must be erased, please flag them and contact the editorial assistant.

3. Copyediting phase.

- When the final version of the article is uploaded to the system, editors must notify the **Editor-in-chief**.
- Editor-in-chief accepts it in the system and officially notifies the author. Then, the manuscript is sent to the copyeditor (current: Lenore Hietkamp).
- <u>Editor/s do not participate in this stage.</u> However, most errors and mistakes not previously fixed will come out during copyediting and typesetting. If editorial work prior to this point is careful and thorough, the rest of the process flows without problems. See Annex 2 to check for every omission.
- From this point, the **copyeditor** comes back and forth through 3 stages with the **authors. Editor-in-chief** and **Editorial Assistant** are cc'ed.
- The **copyeditor's** basic fee is covered by Architectural Histories, however, sometimes the article needs additional copyediting work. This must be covered by the authors. It happens roughly 80% of the time and is more common among non-English speaking authors. If this happens, the copyeditor provides an estimate to be communicated to the author before starting the copyediting process. If the author must pay, the copyeditor sends them an invoice. **Editor's** are not involved.



- Editors must make sure that authors understand and remember the Englishlanguage requirements of Architectural Histories, especially in those cases of non-English speakers who show difficulties with language use.
- If the article needs to be published ASAP, the **Editor-in-chief** communicates with the publisher and asks to speed up the publication process. They can rush typesetting and publication but need to be notified in advance. If publication needs to be stalled, it also must be reported (e.g., for an SC article to wait for the rest of the collection and be published in a batch).
- When the paper comes out of copyediting, the copyeditor sends an automated message to the authors, the Editor-in-chief, and the editorial assistant.
 The Editor-in-chief checks the article sends the paper to typesetting.

4. Typesetting and proofreading phase.

- The first typesetting phase is usually rapid, just a few days. After this, **authors**, **copyeditor**, **Editor-in-chief**, **and editorial assistant** receive a pdf for proof review. The **copyeditor** usually forwards this email from her personal email address so it does not fall into spam folders. Architectural Histories have volunteer **proofreaders** who also receive these documents and check them. Since the **editors** have already approved the article's content in previous stages, larger edits are not possible, and changes in the formulation are only possible in exceptional circumstances (e.g., if the original wording would lead to a misunderstanding).
- All comments and corrections are sent back to the **copyeditor**, who communicates them to the **typesetters**. They then proceed to apply all changes and provide a final version. Please note that edits after proofs have been returned are only possible in exceptional circumstances.
- Post-publication changes are not possible.

5. Publication

- When the paper comes out of typesetting, it is ready for publication. **Editor-in-chief** uploads it into the platform and officially requests it to be published.
- The publisher processes and publishes the article in both pdf and XML formats. Hotfixes and corrections for the XML version are only possible during the first 48 hours. After that, the article has been disseminated through all major indexes; hence a correction would create a discordance between the Journal's version and the indexed one.