

## EDITORIAL PROCESS, PUBLISHING PROCESS

*Submission of manuscripts*

*Procedures for evaluation and acceptance of manuscripts*

*Evaluation Form to be completed by the reviewers*

*After Academic Review*

*Proof-reading*

*Publication and post-publication*

*Offprints*

-----

*Submission of manuscripts*

Researchers who wish to submit a manuscript for publication in *Magnificat CLM*, should do so through OJS platform. Firstly, they will register as an author at <http://ojs.uv.es/index.php/MCLM/user/register>. Then they can upload their manuscript. In this first version, without any authorial marks in it.

If the article has several authors, every one of them must register as author and accept the conditions, and then each and every one of them must upload the same document. Once this is done, their spokesperson will contact [mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es) to identify themselves as their representative for any correspondence with *Magnificat CLM*. This collective uploading by the coauthors will be understood as a statement that all signatories have directly contributed to the intellectual content of the work, assume responsibility for it, approve it, and agree that their name be included among the authors.

When uploading, OJS platform will ask for the author's acceptance of the following statements:

- Originality: the author states that the content of the article has not been published, and does not appear in another work about to be published; the article does not result in duplicate publication (which essentially repeats the same information whether presented in the same way or not, see "[Ethical principles in research and publication](#)"). The signatory is the sole person responsible for the manuscript's content and declares that the text is not the product of plagiarism either in whole or in part, and does not violate copyright laws or other authors' copyrights.
- No simultaneous submission to other publications: the author states that his/her manuscript is only sent to *Magnificat CLM*, and not simultaneously elsewhere, thus not wasting the journal's time and resources.
- File: the author states that the file is sent in .odt or .docx.
- Format: the author states that the text is single-spaced, in a 12-point font, uses italics and not underlining (except for URLs), and that all illustrations, figures and tables appear within the text where they belong, and not at the end.
- Style: the author states that the text meets the requirements and bibliographical style specified in the style sheet, which can be found in the appropriate menu tab, including addition within Works Cited of publications' DOI or URL.

- Anonymity for reviewing: the author states that the document contains no identifying marks.
- ORCID: the author states that s/he is registered in [ORCID](#), and will sign the article with the registered standard version of her/his name.
- Google Scholar: the author states that s/he is registered in [Google Scholar](#) and in other researchers' social networks, at least in [Academia.edu](#) and [Humanities Commons](#), and is committed to promptly upload her/his article's URL once published, and to spread knowledge of it among colleagues and in general through all channels at her/his disposal.
- Acceptance of changes: the author accepts changes to the content and style of her/his manuscript by the editorial board, which can make minor editorial changes to remove occasional typographical or grammatical errors, or unclear expressions, but cannot make any substantive changes to its content.
- Copyright: the author accepts the publication of her/his article under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#).
- Membership of the sponsoring institution. This journal can only accept among its authors a 10% of members of the Universitat de València. Therefore we cannot encourage said members to submit to *Magnificat CLM*, as rejection on these grounds is highly likely. The author accepts this possibility. If this is not your case, just click Agree.
- Only for articles in languages not listed in the norms, or where the choice of language entails particular difficulties: the author agrees to cover the editing costs and linguistic revision of the manuscript, if accepted. If this is not your case, just click Agree.

-----

### *Procedures for reviewing and acceptance of manuscripts*

General process: Once the manuscript is received, the platform sends the author an automatic email confirming its receipt and registration by the journal's editorial board. From there, the paper goes through an editorial review and a subsequent academic review.

Terms: The author will receive the automatic receipt message. If after a fortnight s/he has not been notified otherwise, the author will assume that the manuscript has passed the first review and has been sent for academic review. Within a maximum period of 90 days from this point the author will be informed of the outcome of the academic review.

First review or editorial review:

The editorial overview is the first step in the reviewing process. A rejection at this stage will be notified to the author within a maximum period of twenty-one days. If the article does not conform to the journal's range of themes, or does not meet the formal and linguistic standards required, then it is rejected. If case of acceptance, it will be sent to the second review, or academic review. The first editorial review will adhere to the following questionnaire:

. Does the article fulfill the conditions of delivery required (among them, for example, the author's previous register in at least ORCID, Humanities Commons and Academia.edu)? Please check the author's presence in social networks of researchers.

- . Is the manuscript's material presentation correct? Does it comply with *Magnificat CLM's* presentation instructions?
- . Is the manuscript's linguistic presentation correct? Does it show carelessness in writing, grammatical errors or spelling mistakes?
- . Does it fit the range of *Magnificat CLM's* themes? What is its interest for the journal's readers?

Second review or academic review :

The second revision is the process of academic arbitration through double-blind peer-reviewing system, by at least two reviewers external to the editorial board; a third reviewer will be occasionally used, for example if there are substantial discrepancies between the reports of the first two.

The editor, in consultation with the editorial board and possible advice from members of the academic board, chooses the reviewers, who are completely external to the editorial board and to the publisher, the Universitat de València.

Reviewers are asked to accept this task on the basis of the title, keywords and abstract of the article for review. They also have access to the reviewing instructions, and to the evaluation form.

Only after they have accepted will the reviewers have access to the full article.

Deadline:

Reviewers have thirty-five days to submit their report.

Database of reviewers:

Reviewers who have collaborated with *Magnificat CLM* are registered in an internal, confidential database by the journal and receive, when requested, a certification for their work, for REF purposes, sexennials, accreditations, etc. Out of this database, a list of the journals' reviewers will be published, as demanded by the quality indexes for learned journals. In order to respect reviewers' anonymity, which would otherwise be compromised in a journal that, because of its particular format, will publish few articles per issue, this list will only appear once the journal has published at least thirty-five articles.

Result of the Academic Review :

- . If both reports are negative, the article is rejected.
- . If one is negative and the other report suggests major changes, the article is also rejected.
- . If one report is negative and the other positive or suggests only minor changes, the editorial board has recourse to the arbitration of a third reviewer under the same conditions.
- . If both reports are positive without suggested changes, the article proceeds to publication in the next available issue.
- . If one or both reports suggest minor changes, these are reported to the author, who has thirty-five

days to modify and return the article; the article then proceeds to publication.

. If both reports suggest major changes, these are reported to the author, who can either withdraw the article, or make the changes in 60 days and resubmit it. This new version will be evaluated again in double-blind review. If the second academic assessment is positive (with either no suggestions for changes or minor changes), once adjusted, the article proceeds to publication in the next available issue from the date of delivery of the final version.

Summary of the *Magnificat CLM* academic arbitration system:

Use of external reviewers. Double-blind review system. All *Magnificat CLM* articles are subject to review. The external reviewers are chosen by the director in consultation with members the editorial board with the advice of members of the academic board. The number of reviewers will be two. In case of marked discrepancies, a third party will be brought in. The journal sets the reviewers a deadline of thirty-five days for submission of their reports.

Instructions for Reviewers :

The review process is conducted via Open Journal Systems tools. The reviewer is invited by email to make an original assessment within a maximum of thirty-five days from acceptance. This email supplies the title, keywords and abstract. If the reviewer accepts the task, s/he simply clicks on the link of acceptance. This will automatically take him/her to the text for evaluation, which must always be treated with the utmost confidentiality. If the reviewer knows of any reason which would produce a conflict of interest if s/he were to take on the review, s/he is obliged to decline it.

Through the OJS platform, the reviewer will be given the evaluation form; this will be completed and delivered by the same route by following the link. The evaluation will address specific aspects of content, academic quality, methodology and style, following, with certain adjustments, the model of the evaluation form of the prestigious *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*, as reproduced below.

If the reviewer has not submitted the report by the stated time, the OJS platform will send an automatic reminder. If after a week the reviewer has not submitted the report or justified the delay, it is understood that he/she has decided to decline the work, and the editorial board will contact a replacement.

Abstention: The reviewer may also at any time within the thirty-five days, withdraw via email to [mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es), specifying the reasons for his/her resignation.

Reviewers must remember at all times that confidentiality is essential to the review process.

*Magnificat CLM* offers its reviewers, when so requested by email to [mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es), a certification for their work when s/he needs it in order to comply with the Research Reference Framework or its equivalent (sexennials, accreditations, etc.).

The communication system of journal reviewers is always via the web, through specific tool within the OJS platform.

-----

*Evaluation Form to be completed by the reviewers*

*Magnificat Medieval Literature and Culture*

Universitat de València

Departament de Filologia Catalana

Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 32

tel. + 34 96 386 42 55

[mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es)

<http://ojs.uv.es/mclm>

Title of article :

Date of submission :

Name of reviewer:

Email:

Details of institutional affiliation (department and / or institution to which you belong, address and telephone number) :

1. Does the article's title clearly reflect its purpose?
2. How do you evaluate the originality and academic contribution made by the article?
3. Is the organization of the article correct, and the exposition clear?
4. Are the objectives, hypotheses, methodology and conclusions of the study clear and consistent?
5. Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the data provided?
6. If there are tables and other illustrations are they necessary and correctly designed?
7. Are the references adequate or are they missing fundamental work done in the area or the subject of the article? In this case, mention a few.
8. If it is a discussion of the state of the art, a literature review or dissemination of a given topic, how would you evaluate its rigour, depth and timeliness and its interest for the journal?
9. How would you evaluate the formal aspects of the work: writing style, notes and quotations translated by the author, organization of text, abstract. .. ?
10. Do you think that the length of the work is appropriate ?
11. The work is acceptable for publication in *Magnificat CLM*:
  - a) without changes.
  - b) with minor, secondary modifications.
  - c) if restructured after profound modifications.
  - d) should be rejected.
12. Additional comments and specific suggestions (use the space you deem necessary).
13. Do you wish to suggest other possible external reviewers to whom, in your opinion, this article could be sent in case of third arbitration? Please supply an email address if possible.
14. In the future, when the journal has published at least thirty-five articles, do you have any objection to our publishing your name on a list of external evaluators who have collaborated with *Magnificat CLM*, without, of course, reference to any particular article?
15. Would you suggest any improvement in the method of assessment of manuscripts (standards, protocols, assessment tools) used by *Magnificat CLM*?

Name of the reviewer and date

-----

### *After Academic Review*

Decisions regarding manuscripts submitted will be made by the editorial board, according to the results of the initial review and, of the second, if it has been undertaken. The results of these evaluations will be forwarded to the author within seven days from the end of receipt of reviews, which will be recorded in OJS. The direction will send to the author, also via OJS, a clear summary of the reports on his/her manuscript, and requested changes, if any.

If changes have been suggested, the author can indicate via the same route, the OJS platform, that he/she accepts them or prefers to withdraw. If agreed, a new version will be sent to OJS incorporating the changes and identifying them clearly (within a maximum of thirty-five days if the changes are minor, or sixty days if the changes are greater). If necessary, rejected changes will also be clearly indicated, with justification.

Notification of the final decision:

In the letter to the author in which the journal's final decision is communicated, it will also be indicated in which number the article will be published, and when the author will receive proofs for correction.

The final decision of rejection of a manuscript is final.

The journal does not return manuscripts.

-----

### *Proof-reading*

The author will receive a set of proofs in electronic form, to be marked up by hand. Once the corrections have been made, s/he will scan her/his revised proofs and load the resulting pdf on *Magnificat CLM* OJS platform by clicking on the corresponding link.

The author will correct in the proofs misprints and grammatical errors, but will not introduce amendments affecting content.

System of proof-correction symbols:

Magnificat CLM suggests the use of the [system of symbols recommended by ISO 5776](http://www.iso.org/iso/5776.html), but also

accepts standard correction norms used in the humanities.

Deadline:

The author will have twenty-one days to correct and return text.

-----

### *Publication and post-publication*

As *Magnificat CLM* is an annual publication, the period between the final acceptance of a manuscript and its publication will be at least half a year. Once publication has begun, the editorial board's aim is to include this information in the journal's statistics as mentioned in the "[Statistical reports on the editorial process](#)".

Post-publication review:

The editorial board, which will have made several revisions to all the texts in a volume throughout the publication process, will also conduct a post-publication review, in order to detect and correct any significant errata. Readers or authors who detects errors of importance may communicate them to [mclm@uv](mailto:mclm@uv).

The correction of errors post-publication will be made in two ways: (a) by adding them in an unpagged appendix to the end of the pdf article (b) immediately announcing this correction in the "Notes" section of the journal OJS platform, without waiting for the next issue. This information will also appear in the same section in the next issue.

The list of errata will clearly identify the error, its place in the text, and the correct version.

-----

### *Offprints*

In an electronic journal such as *Magnificat CLM*, the paper offprints of old are replaced by pdf e-prints. The authors, who will be notified when the issue is released, can download their articles direct from the journal, as can readers.

Authors must agree, when they submit their manuscript to the journal, to disseminate the e-print in the repository of their institution and social networks of researchers (Google Scholar, Humanities Commons, [Academia.edu](http://Academia.edu), etc.). Tutorial on Google Scholar: <http://tinyurl.com/pt9fouk> [ ESP ].

## PEER REVIEW

### 1) *Evaluation Policy*

*Magnificat CLM* aspires to the highest academic excellence.

The review process of articles will be made anonymously through the double-blind system, ensuring mutual anonymity of reviewers and authors.

Articles will be subject to a preliminary review by the editorial board that will check whether the article meets the thematic and formal criteria laid down in the rules of publication. If so, the item will be submitted to a double-blind peer review, by at least two specialists in the subject area of the article.

Reviewers will: 1. Approve the publication of the article in the version as submitted. 2. Request significant changes in the article (which will prompt a second review by the same evaluators or by others). 3. Indicate its suitability for publication after making minor changes. 4. Reject article in the case of a doubly negative assessment. In case of marked divergence between the assessments of two reviewers, the text will be sent to a third reviewer, whose assessment, added to the previous two, decides for or against publication.

The peer-reviewers will be completely external to the editorial board and the publisher, the Universitat de València.

The evaluation form can be seen here.

This is the abbreviated version of the assessment policy. The full version can be seen in the section “Editorial process”.

### 2) *Evaluation Guidelines*

The review process is made with Open Journal Systems tools. The reviewer is invited by email to make an original assessment within a maximum of thirty-five days from acceptance. This email will show title, keywords and abstract.

The review process is conducted via Open Journal Systems tools. The reviewer is invited by email to make an original assessment within a maximum of thirty-five days from acceptance. This email supplies the title, keywords and abstract. If the reviewer accepts the task, s/he simply clicks on the link of acceptance. This will automatically take him/her to the text for evaluation, which must always be treated with the utmost confidentiality. If the reviewer knows of any reason which would produce a conflict of interest if s/he were to take on the review, s/he is obliged to decline it.

Through the OJS platform, the reviewer will be given the evaluation form; this will be completed and delivered by the same route by following the link. The evaluation will address specific aspects of content, academic quality, methodology and style, following, with certain adjustments, the model of the evaluation form of the prestigious *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* as reproduced below.



If the reviewer has not submitted the report by the stated time, the OJS platform will send an automatic reminder. If after a week the reviewer has not submitted the report or justified the delay, it is understood that he/she has decided to decline the work, and the editorial board will contact a replacement.

Abstention: The reviewer may also at any time within the thirty-five days, withdraw via email to [mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es), specifying the reasons for his/her resignation.

Reviewers must remember at all times that confidentiality is essential to the review process.

*Magnificat CLM* offers its reviewers, when requested by email to [mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es), a certification for their work when s/he needed in order to comply with the Research Reference Framework or its equivalent (sexennia, accreditations, etc.).

Communication with reviewers is always via the web, using the specific tool within the OJS platform.

-----

*Evaluation Form to be completed by the reviewers*

*Magnificat Medieval Literature and Culture*

Universitat de València

Departament de Filologia Catalana

Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 32

tel. + 34 96 386 42 55

[mclm@uv.es](mailto:mclm@uv.es)

<http://ojs.uv.es/mclm>

Title of article :

Date of submission :

Name of reviewer:

Email:

Details of institutional affiliation (department and / or institution to which you belong, address and telephone number) :

1. Does the article's title clearly reflect its purpose?
2. How do you evaluate the originality and academic contribution made by the article?
3. Is the organization of the article correct, and the exposition clear?
4. Are the objectives, hypotheses, methodology and conclusions of the study clear and consistent?
5. Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the data provided?
6. If there are tables and other illustrations are they necessary and correctly designed?
7. Are the references adequate or are they missing fundamental work done in the area or the subject of the article? In this case, mention a few.
8. If it is a discussion of the state of the art, a literature review or dissemination of a given topic, how would you evaluate its rigour, depth and timeliness and its interest for the journal?

9. How would you evaluate the formal aspects of the work: writing style, notes and quotations translated by the author, organization of text, abstract. ... ?
10. Do you think that the length of the work is appropriate ?
11. The work is acceptable for publication in *Magnificat CLM*:
  - a) without changes.
  - b) with minor, secondary modifications.
  - c) if restructured after profound modifications.
  - d) should be rejected.
12. Additional comments and specific suggestions (use the space you deem necessary).
13. Do you wish to suggest other possible external reviewers to whom, in your opinion, this article could be sent in case of third arbitration? Please supply an email address if possible.
14. In the future, when the journal has published at least thirty-five articles, do you have any objection to our publishing your name on a list of external evaluators who have collaborated with *Magnificat CLM*, without, of course, reference to any particular article?
15. Would you suggest any improvement in the method of assessment of manuscripts (standards, protocols, assessment tools) used by *Magnificat CLM*?

Name of the reviewer and date

-----

Text of the present document under [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

-----