

## Housing Studies Journal- Guidance on Reviews



This note provides guidance for authors, reviewers and editors on our journals' reviewing processes.

Rigorous peer-review is essential to the journal's aims of publishing world-leading research in housing studies and our reviewing processes are aimed at ensuring that the highest academic standards are maintained, that published papers have been significantly enhanced by the review process (where appropriate), and that authors receive constructive and useful feedback on their work.

The aims of the journal's reviewing procedures are that:

- Authors receive, wherever possible, a decision on a submitted paper within 3 months of submission
- There will normally be at least three reviewers of a paper. This will include a member of the journal's management board or international editorial advisory board and aims to ensure area expertise, a geographical mix of reviewers and a mix of reviewers in terms of gender and academic career stage
- Reviews will be accurate and insightful and will provide constructive feedback for authors, including clear instructions to authors about any suggested required revisions
- Editors' letters to authors will clearly indicate the decision made, the rationales for this and set out explicitly any required revisions (where appropriate)
- Authors and reviewers will be able to access support and guidance from editors and the journal manager about submitting their papers and reviews

The journal aims to publish the very best research and academic writing on housing studies.

Therefore, we ask that our reviewers provide a clear assessment of:

- The originality of the work in terms of making a new contribution to knowledge and understanding and the extent to which this originality is explicitly evidenced in the paper, including demonstrating substantial knowledge of existing work in the field and how a paper will add to this.
- The rigour of the work in terms of the underpinning research methods, the explanation of, and reflection upon, these methods, and the quality of the data or theoretical analysis and argumentation in the paper.
- The significance of the paper to housing studies and the extent to which the paper makes an substantive empirical, theoretical, methodological or policy applied contribution that is of importance to the international and interdisciplinary readership of the journal. This requires papers to go beyond mere technical proficiency or a very limited geographical or subject area focus
- The clarity of expression and argumentation, use of English language and structure of the paper, including the abstract

The journal uses a series of decision categories in its assessment of submitted papers. Details of these decision outcomes and an explanation of them is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Housing Studies Journal Decisions Categories**

Decision	Explanation
Accept	Where the assessment of the editors, informed by the review process, is that the paper meets the standards of the journal and should be accepted for publication without the need for further revisions (some minor editing tasks may still be required at the proofs checking stage) .
Conditional accept	Where the assessments of the editors and reviewers are that the paper meets the standards of the journal but some minor revisions are required before the final version of the paper is accepted for publication. <b>A revised version is assessed by the editors and not sent out again for peer review.</b>
Minor revision	Where the assessment of the editors and the reviewers is that the paper has significant merit and will make a strong contribution to the field but where some further limited revisions are required to meet the standards of the journal and maximise its contribution. <b>A revised version is normally assessed by editors and not sent out again for peer review.</b>
Major revision	Where the assessment of the editors and the reviewers is that the paper has merit and potential but where significant further revisions are required in order for the paper to meet the standards of the journal. Authors will be clearly informed of the required revisions that should be made. <b>In almost all cases a revised version of the paper will be sent out for further peer review</b> (where possible involving the original reviewers of the paper). In some cases, at the discretion of the editors, a revised paper may be deemed to have sufficiently addressed the required revisions such that it is not sent out again for further review.
Reject and resubmit	Where the assessment of the editors and reviewers is that the paper does not currently meet the standards of the journal and will require very substantive revisions to be considered for publication; but where there is sufficient potential in the paper for a substantively revised version to be considered. <b>A resubmitted paper will always be sent out for full peer review again.</b>
Reject	Where the assessment of the editors and reviewers is that the paper is unlikely, even following revision, to meet the required standards of the journal <b>OR</b> where a resubmitted or revised paper has failed to advance to the next stage of the decision process*
Managing Editor Immediate Reject	Where a paper is deemed to evidently not meet the required standards of the journal the editors may decide to immediately reject it and not sent it out for peer review. This will be on the basis that it is technically deficient (not provided in the correct style or format or being too short to develop a robust argument); the subject matter not being sufficiently relevant to the readership of the journal; the potential impact of the paper being assessed as being too low for the journal (this may include technically proficient papers that do not evidence the potential to make a sufficiently original or significant contribution); or the standard of the paper is deemed too low for the journal. At the discretion of the editors, authors may be asked to address key issues and consider resubmitting the paper.

**\*It is the editorial policy of the journal that a paper must advance to at least the next level of decision in each round of submission, i.e. a revised version of a paper that previously received a ‘major revision’ decision must achieve a new decision of at least ‘minor revision’.** This applies at all

stages of decisions *and it is therefore essential that editors' and reviewers' comments are robustly addressed whatever stage in the process a paper is at.*