

Editorial Practice

Planning Theory and Practice publishes original articles and review papers from both academics and practitioners with the aim of encouraging more effective, two-way communication between theory and practice. While we publish many papers by established authors, contributions from those in the early stages of their academic careers are also encouraged, as are rejoinders to items previously published. Editors are happy to discuss ideas about papers prior to submission.

Planning Theory and Practice does not represent any particular philosophical school. Instead, we believe in publishing articles from a rich variety of critical and methodological perspectives. This includes both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

We expect all articles to be rigorously researched. In particular, they should be supported by robust analytical frameworks, with research methodology openly discussed and defended. Authors are expected to engage with current debates in their field, and to draw out the wider significance of their particular contribution. We recognize that our field is multidisciplinary, and that practices vary substantially from place to place. Without exception, we expect all submissions to be written in a clear, coherent style of English, accessible to a broad, international audience.

We operate a robust, double-blind refereeing process, which aims to be both positive and fair, without giving false hope to authors about the outcome of the process.

1. After an article is received via Manuscript Central, it is checked by the journal manager for completeness and anonymity.
2. The article is then referred to two senior editors, who read it and exchange views.
3. A paper is then either rejected outright, which may include suggestions about how it might be improved, or sent to a group of 4-6 referees, with the aim of achieving at least 3 referee reports.
4. Referees are given a deadline (usually around 5 weeks) to respond to the paper. They are chased if their reports fall late. We are fortunate to have very dedicated reviewers of very high standing in the field of spatial planning, many of whom are also members of our Editorial Board.
5. The three referee reports are sent to the senior editors, who make a final decision. This is explained in a letter to the author, who also receives anonymous copies of the referee reports. Where contradictory revisions are requested, the editors give a clear summary of the changes they require. The four main outcomes for a paper are:
 - a. Accept, usually with minor revisions.

- b. Major revisions, with positive encouragement
 - c. Very major revisions, amounting to a very significant rewrite of the paper
 - d. Reject
6. The author reworks the paper, and resubmits it on Manuscript Central as a revised item. The senior editors then re-read the piece. If they consider the changes inadequate, they will refer the paper back to its author. If not, they will send it out to referees for approval. To avoid confusion, the same people who originally read and commented on the manuscript are contacted.
 7. The paper will either be rejected, conditionally approved subject to the recommendations of the reviewers, or approved for publication at this stage. Approved papers are then sent to the Journal Manager for final subediting. Corrections are sent to the author for approval.
 8. The paper is sent to the publisher. At proofreading stage, both the author and a member of the journal's editorial team check the manuscript.