

Editorial Policy

1. General Review

General review is the responsibility of the journal editors and the editorial board. Upon receipt of a submission, the editors determine firstly whether the submission is:

1. Of satisfactory academic standard
2. Within the scope of the journal

If the editors consider that a submission fails to meet one or both of these criteria, the submission is then forwarded to a board member with relevant expertise. If the board member concurs with the editors, the submission is returned. If the board member does not concur with the editors, then the submission goes forward to review.

Submissions are reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers. All reviewing is anonymous, unless the editors and the reviewer agree otherwise. Reviewers are selected on the basis that there should be no conflict of interest in their reviewing the submission. Examples of conflict of interest include:

1. Being employed by, or holding an honorary, adjunct, or visiting appointment at an institution hosting one or more of the authors.
2. Being a current or recent past principal supervisor (within the last 5 years) of the higher degree of an author.
3. Being a collaborator with one of the authors (no joint publications, grants, or grant proposals within the last 5 years)
4. Having a close, personal relationship (including enmity) with an author.

Authors may request that certain persons be excluded as reviewers. Agreement to such requests is at the discretion of the editors.

1.1 Initial Submission

With an initial submission, reviewers are requested to return a report evaluating the submission into one of the following four categories.

1. Publish as is
2. Publish subject to minor revisions
3. Revise and resubmit
4. Not suitable for AJL

In order for a manuscript to be accepted on initial submission, all reviews must evaluate it as either Category 1 or Category 2. If this is the case, then subject to the satisfactory completion of any minor revisions required, the manuscript proceeds to publication.

If a manuscript receives one or more reviews evaluating it as Category 4, then it is returned to the authors together with the reviews. It is at the discretion of the editors whether resubmission is permitted.

If a manuscript receives one or more reviews evaluating it as Category 3, and none evaluating it as Category 4, then it is returned to the authors together the reviews and advice that resubmission is permitted.

1.2 Resubmission and re-review.

Wherever possible, re-review is undertaken by the reviewers of the original submission. Re-reviewers are provided with a copy of their comments on the original submission.

With resubmission, reviewers are requested to return a report evaluating the resubmission into one of the following three categories.

1. Publish as is
2. Publish subject to minor revisions
3. Not suitable for AJL

Reviewers are advised that the manuscript is a resubmission and that the option for major revisions is not available to resubmissions.

In order for a manuscript to be accepted on resubmission, all reviews must evaluate it as either Category 1 or Category 2. If this is the case, then subject to the satisfactory completion of any minor revisions required, the manuscript proceeds to publication.

If a resubmitted manuscript receives one or more reviews evaluating it as Category 3, then it is returned to the authors together with the reviews. The authors are advised that further resubmission is not possible.

2. Guest Edited Volumes.

There are two categories of submissions in guest edited volumes.

1. Submissions where one or more of the guest editors is an author.
2. Submissions where none of the guest editors is an author.

Submissions falling within the first category are the responsibility solely of the journal editors. Submissions falling within the second category are the responsibility of both the guest editors and the journal editors. For submissions in the second category, the guest editors have the following responsibilities.

1. Conduct the general review process as set out in §1
2. Liaise with the publishers of the journal in relation to all editorial copy matters

For submissions in the second category, the journal editors have the following responsibilities.

1. The journal editors must deem suitable all reviewers proposed by the guest editors. If the journal editors deem a reviewer unsuitable, the guest editors must provide an alternate suitable reviewer.
2. The journal editors must deem satisfactory all reviews. If the journal editors deem a review unsatisfactory, then the guest editors must provide an alternate satisfactory review.

3. Editorial Board

Members of the editorial board are appointed for 5 year terms by the Executive Committee of the Australian Linguistic Society. The responsibilities of the Editorial Board members are the following.

1. To review manuscripts to determine their suitability for the general review process, as requested by the journal editors.
2. To review manuscripts as a part of the general review process, as requested by the journal editors.
3. To encourage submissions to the journal