

USE OF THE PEER-REVIEW LABEL

The publication series uses the national peer-review label registered by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies and is committed to complying with the terms set for the use of the label and to promoting the principles of the peer-review instructions issued by the Finnish Association of Scholarly Publishing as well as the Responsible conduct of research guidelines published by the Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) in its own publishing activities.

Peer-review label: <https://www.tsv.fi/en/services/label-for-peer-reviewed-scholarly-publications>

Guidelines of the Finnish Association for Scholarly Publishing concerning peer-reviews: <http://www.tiedekustantajat.fi/stl-files/STL-referee09.pdf>

Responsible conduct of research: https://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/HTK_ohje_2012.pdf

DESCRIPTION OF THE PEER-REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE ACTA SCENICA SERIES

Which publications are peer-reviewed?

- All article collections and books that are intended to be published as part of the Acta Scenica Series are peer-reviewed.

How are the publication proposals processed?

- The publication proposals are processed by an editorial board.
- The publisher keeps regular electronic records of the key review information and documents related to the manuscripts accepted for the review process:
 - As concerns published refereed manuscripts, the recorded data must include at least the publication proposal by the authors, opinions issued by the reviewers, decisions on the publication made by the editors and sent to the authors.
 - For refereed manuscripts that are not published, the recorded data must include at least the name of publication and names of authors mentioned in the publication proposal, as well as the names of referees.
 - This is not public data and will not be regularly reported to TSV. However, the publishers will commit themselves to providing TSV or TENK with the details and documents related to an individual book or article if asked to do so.
 -

Who makes the decision on launching a peer-review process?

- The editorial board assesses whether a manuscript is suitable for the publication series and makes a decision on the launch of a peer-review process.
- The editorial board negotiates on the schedule and resources with the author of the publication proposal.
- The author of the publication proposal will be informed within a reasonable time period whether the publication proposal is rejected or whether the peer-review process is launched and in which schedule.
- The members of the editorial board make a decision on who among them will be in contact with the peer-reviewers.

Who can act as a peer-reviewer?

- The editorial board requests statements on whether a manuscript is academically suitable for publication from a minimum of two persons who have been called upon to act as a reviewer.
- The referees are researchers with a doctoral degree or other experts selected outside of the editorial board and impartial in relation to the submitted manuscript.
- The referees operate anonymously, but the publication proposal and the names of the referees for all reviewed manuscripts are kept in the editorial board's archive.
- If a person is a close relative of the author/authors of the manuscript or works as a job supervisor, subordinate or thesis supervisor of the author/authors or has had joint publications with the author/authors during the last three years, the person cannot be selected as an expert.

What aspects are reviewed in the process?

- The process focuses on evaluating the applicability and topicality of the methods, materials and topic in question, the reliability and accuracy of the execution, and the originality and novelty value of the whole in relation to previous research in a manner characteristic of the academic field.
- Each referee suggests either the rejection of the publication proposal or its approval as is or after the implementation of specific changes.

Who makes the decision on whether a manuscript is published?

- The editorial board makes the final decision on whether a manuscript is published based on the given statements.
- The statements are delivered to the authors after their arrival within a reasonable time period. The editorial board also presents an assessment on the changes that are potentially required before publishing and their decision on whether the publication proposal should be approved or rejected.
- The author commits to submitting the final version to the editorial board within an agreed-upon time.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS OF A PUBLICATION PROPOSAL

The publication proposal is submitted via an agreed-upon digital platform or by email to the editorial board.

The publication proposal must include all the names and contact information of the authors of the proposal and information on which of them is the contact person. Before sending the publication proposal, the contact person for the publication must make sure that all the authors approve the publication proposal as well as the terms of Uniarts Helsinki's publishing agreement.

The whole manuscript offered for publication and its summary written in accordance with the style and format guidelines given by the editorial board are delivered as an attachment to the publication proposal. Due to the nature of artistic research, Acta Scenica uses a single-blind review process, which means that the peer-reviewers maintain their anonymity. When a publication includes artistic material, it is not always possible to maintain the anonymity of the author.

Acta Scenica publishes in Finnish and English; other publication languages are possible only upon separate agreement.

If the publication proposal includes works (e.g. images) covered by copyright that aren't made by the authors themselves, the author is in charge of acquiring the necessary rights for the work.

The proposal offered for publication must be previously unpublished, and it may not be under review to be published on other publication forums at the same time.

GUIDELINES FOR PEER-REVIEWERS

When the expert commits to giving a statement, they must confirm that they understand and adhere to the following principles:

- All publication proposals that are under review are confidential material.
- They are not to be discussed or shown to outsiders.
- Reviewers may not derive personal gain from the content of an unpublished publication proposal.

The purpose of the expert statement is to help the editorial board to decide on whether the manuscript is academically suitable for publication. It is possible to include separate remarks for the editorial board in the statement. The copy of the actual statement is always sent to the author, as well.

The expert writes a statement where they express their reasoning on the merits and shortcomings of the publication proposal in terms of the content, structure, possible audio-visual material and other noteworthy elements. A typical review statement is 2–6 pages in length, and it is sent to the designated representative of the editorial board in accordance with the agreed-upon schedule. The expert is advised to use the following scale in their review:

- 1) The publication proposal can be published as is
- 2) The publication proposal may be approved if the suggested changes and corrections are made
- 3) The publication proposal should be rejected

The following questions are useful in the peer-review:

- In what ways is the publication proposal interesting as art research, artistic research or art-pedagogical research in the field of performing arts? Which characteristics of the publication proposal do you find interesting? What are the best aspects of this publication proposal?
- What kind of a role does making art have in this research in terms of methodology, source material, final conclusion etc.? Are the topic, methods or final conclusions of the publication proposal consistent? Does the publication proposal form a well-motivated and coherent whole?

- Does the publication proposal demonstrate originality when it comes to the topic and the way it is discussed? If the publication proposal is accessible on a digital platform, how does it utilise the possibilities provided by the platform?
- How is the topic of the publication proposal linked to a wider context, research or previous discussion? This may refer to addressing social, artistic/or theoretical questions; engaging in dialogue with views expressed by other artists that are relevant to this work; and/or documentation on the work carried out by the artist leading to this publication proposal.
- What kind of new information, insights or experiences does the publication proposal generate in the arts and/or the field of art pedagogy? Are the methods used sufficient and reliable? What about the thoroughness of the research, analysis and/or the experiment?
- Does the publication proposal require revision (for example, proofreading by a native speaker), or support with technical issues or layout?
- Are there specific ethical problems or legal issues involved with the publication proposal that may affect the publication (e.g. anonymisation, representation of animals or people, copyright)? Cf. <http://www.tenk.fi/ohjeet-ja-julkaisut>.
- Please provide a short assessment on the strengths and weaknesses of the publication proposal and give the author/authors feedback on potential edit suggestions.

The expert statement is written in a constructive, encouraging and well-motivated manner with consideration to different writing styles and the fact that research embraces various voices. If the referee finds the publication proposal inadequate, they are expected to offer the author concrete suggestions on how to improve the proposal.

Any overlapping with previously published material and suspicions of plagiarism or deficiencies concerning the citation of references and sources must be mentioned in the statement.

No remuneration is paid for giving the statement, but evaluation duties as an expert are regarded as academic merit.

More guidelines for peer-reviews can be found on the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies' website: <https://www.tsv.fi/fi/palvelut/tunnus/lisatieto-vertaisarvioinnista>