



Instructions for Royal Studies Journal Special Editors

Many thanks for your interest in editing a special issue of the *Royal Studies Journal*. We look forward to working with you on your collection and have put together these instructions and guidelines to help you through the process and answer any questions you might have.

Step 1) Proposal

If you have not done so already, we need a proposal from you outlining the theme and proposed content of your special issue. We appreciate that if you have proposed a special issue for a slot which is two or more years from production that your proposed articles and contributors are subject to change. Please keep us updated and we will need a firm outline of proposed content 12-18 months before your article is published (see timeline below). Again we appreciate this is subject to any articles failing to be submitted or failing to successfully complete the review and revision process.

Step 2) Submission, Review & Revision

All articles, whether for regular or special issues must go through the RSJ's double blind peer review process. The entire review process will take place within our online system to ensure the process is completed efficiently while remaining double blind and giving us visibility into the progress of your special issue so that we can support you effectively. We are happy to provide training and technical support for special editors to use the system or we can liaise with you to keep you updated on the progress of your articles in electronic system and relay your decisions and actions for you online if you find the system difficult to access or use.

All authors should submit their initial version of their articles into the system, following the timeline below. Special editors will then initiate the review process. Before doing so, you need to check to make sure that all identifying elements on the submission (author's name, remaining comments/track changes) have been removed. If the author has just left their name on, remove this and upload the adjusted article as a new 'review version'—make sure you send that version out to review. If there are substantial identifiers, ask the author to upload a clean file.

Please also check that the author has included an abstract and 4-8 keywords. If the article is in one of the European languages that we publish in (French, German, Spanish or Portuguese), ensure they have included titles, abstracts and keywords in BOTH English and the language of publication. If either of these elements are missing, please ask the author to rectify them, ideally before review but definitely before the article goes into production.

All articles should have at least two reviewers but you have a choice of how to best achieve this. We recommend that one of the reviewers is the special editor or their co-editor so that you have editorial input. We appreciate that this review will not be fully 'blind' but gives you editorial feedback which is important for the coherence of the issue. The second reviewer should be an

external reviewer—you can use our bank of reviewers in the system or assign one that you have chosen who is not already in our database (we can show you how to add new reviewers to the system). You can have as many external or editorial reviewers as you feel necessary but we recommend at least one of each type. Once the reviewers' reports come back you can send the feedback to the author through the system and set them a deadline for a revised version of the article. Based on the amount of work required by the reviewers, the article may need to undergo a second round of review (just editorial or editorial + external) and possibly more revision before it is ready to go into production, ensure that you leave plenty of time for this eventuality. Keep in mind that part of your role as a special editor is to provide some framing for your pieces by both ensuring cohesion and quality through the review and revision process and by writing an introductory piece which will introduce the issue and draw together the contents. The Editor in Chief is happy to act as the editorial reviewer or one of the reviewers for your introductory piece to give you feedback prior to publication.

Step 3) Production

Once the article has been revised and is agreed to be of publishable standard, you need to run some final checks:

- Footnotes: do the footnotes conform to Chicago style? The *RSJ* does not allow the use of *ibid.*, *et. al.*, *op. cit.*, *passim*, *ff.*, etc. All page ranges should be given in full and not truncated. Shortened/subsequent references should always include author's surname and shortened title.
- Bibliography: does the article include a bibliography of all works cited, divided between primary and secondary sources, also in Chicago style?
- Images: are the images provided of sufficient quality for use? Has the author secured the necessary permissions, and have these permissions been uploaded as a supplementary file?
 - *Please note that all images not in the public domain will require publication permissions, even if they are owned by the author.*
- Translations: all sources must be translated into the language of the article, with the original language source included in the footnotes.
- Formatting: does the file broadly conform to the journal's requirements? This means no use of formatting styles (so no Heading 1, etc), all paragraphs are indicated by an indent of 1.27cm (not a blank line, and no after spacing), and that the whole file is in Garamond, size 12.

If any of these items are missing or incomplete, the article cannot be sent to production until they have been rectified. Once this is done, the special editor needs to 'accept' the article and send it to production through the system. At this stage, the bulk of the work for the special editor is complete and the Production Team will take over through the copyediting, layout (typesetting) and proofreading processes. We may be in touch with you with queries or to ask you to help us with any contributors who are being unresponsive or need additional support through the production process.

Timeline (*note that Special Issues are normally published in June*):

- **REVIEW:**
 - January-June (year PRIOR to publication): Definitive list of projected content for the issue sent to the Editor in Chief
 - June-September: Initial submission of articles for review
 - September-January: Review & revision period
 - December-February: Final accepted, post-review articles begin production (The LASTEST that copy can be accepted for the issue is February 1)
- **PRODUCTION:**
 - January/February: In-house copyediting
 - February/March: Two weeks for authors to copyedit their articles
 - April: Layout process in-house (typesetting)
 - May: Two weeks for authors to proof their articles, followed by our in-house proofing
 - June: Publication