

Globethics Publications

Editorial and Peer-Review Processes

Two distinct and transparent processes

Editorial Process

A book is part of a publication series, except for selected co-publications published outside of the Globethics series. The volume editors are responsible for the quality of the content submitted. The managing editor coordinates between the series editors, who may propose new book projects, and the production team, on the one side, and the volume editors and peer reviewers on the other side. The peer review process is not part of the editing process as such. Some books published by Globethics Publications are not part of a peer-review process, because the nature of these books is distinct from an academic research and requirements different (Doctoral dissertations, Policies, teaching handbooks, practical educational material, Reports). Globethics relies on the collaboration with partner institutions, with the relevant competencies for guaranteeing the quality of the work, in carrying out the peer-review. The series editors and the managing editor are responsible for assessing if the quality standards of a publication project are met (based on a quality standard checklist, see last part).

Peer Review Process

Academic monographs and multi-authored volumes are subject to a peer-review process, through an independent and external procedure. Globethics has established a list of academic institutions, who provide a reliable, independent and high-quality peer-review through their staff and faculty members. These institutions include *inter alia* the following:

- The Institute of Research and Action on Fraud and Plagiarism in Academia (IRAFPA), Switzerland,
- The University of South Africa (UNISA), South Africa
- Stadio Holding Ltd., South Africa
- Trinity Theological College, Singapore
- The Center for International Business Ethics, Beijing, China
- The Faculty of Education of the Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA) in Nairobi, Kenya
- The Conference of European Churches (CEC), Belgium
- The World Council of Churches, Global with HO in Switzerland
- The Academy of Religions at the Minzu University in China
- The Workshop for Water Ethics, Switzerland
- The Vietnam Hoc Institute, Switzerland
- Interdisciplinary Institute of Ethics and Human Rights, University of Fribourg, Switzerland
- Foundation Vittorino Chizzolini, Bergamo, Italy,
- Ethics & Trust in Finance Prize and the Observatoire de la Finance, Geneva, Switzerland.

Objective and Method of the Peer-Review

The main objective of the peer-review process Globethics pursues is to provide the highest possible quality of its publications from an international pool of authors for an academic audience in all regions of the world.

Globethics does follow strict principles of due diligence and engages with each institution on a clear framework to follow for each peer-review process. In a proximity-based peer-review, ideally each author knows by whom he/she is receiving a peer-review. In some cases, experts from specific disciplinary areas need to be identified, which is not self-evident. The same is valid for geographical or contextual competencies, linguistic competency, gender sensitivity, the respect for specific age

groups, and academic traditions. Globethics is poised to enlarge its pool of peer-reviewers from among its global network to ensure the best possible conditions for a peer-review process that guarantee both international quality standards and reflect the organisation's dedication to cross-cultural diversity in the advancement of knowledge.

We observed that instead of enhancing the quality, a double blind peer-review is sometimes not helpful. Reviewers may be tempted to hide behind the fact that the reviewer's identity is not known to the author (and vice versa). There is often also a temptation to deliver a poor correction of the work, and in extreme cases, there might be cultural, gender or overall social biases, and therefore a lack of optimal conditions for academic integrity.

The proximity-based peer-review method applied is not a double blind based process as a general rule, even though some books have been reviewed using this method. There are two reviewers for each book chapter of multi-authored books, and corrections requested are based on careful reading and commentary of the document. A reviewer team is composed *ad minima* by one experienced scholar with a doctoral degree. The book chapters are not directly conference proceedings, all should be original contributions with serious peer-review. An original contribution may be refused after the peer-review, in case the author fails to follow the publication standards set by the volume editors. This is valid, in particular, if the similarity check has shown evidence of the necessity to rework the text. In the case of a suspicion of plagiarism or academic cheating, the work is signalled to the managing editor and the executive director for verification. A volume editor may be liberated from his/her tasks, if a volume editor does not contribute in a significant manner to the practical and theoretical aspects of the project.

Quality Standard Checklist

Critical attributes of the paper:

1. Contribution to the academic field
2. Quality and relevance of the ideas
3. Coherence and logical flow of the paper
4. Language and writing style
5. Technical merit of the paper (construction and implementation of the publication guidelines, see separate document).

The Peer-Review Report

The peer-reviewers will write a report in view of assessing the paper based on the following four crucial questions:

1. How would the reviewer rate the contribution, relevance and importance of the book or the chapter in advancing knowledge on the overall theme: [main theme of the book]?
2. How would the reviewer rate the clarity of the ideas, argumentation and objectives of the book or chapter? Which recommendations for improvement are there?
3. How coherent is the presentation of ideas in the book or chapter, including the review of the relevant literature, data analysis, the presentation and interpretation of the findings, and the discussion? How can the presentation be improved?
4. How would the reviewer rate the use of language and overall expression/writing style in the paper? How can the language and style be improved?