

Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History (ZF/SCH)

The review process

ZF/SCH is a peer-reviewed journal. All contributions are reviewed in accordance with the specific guidelines for each section. The following remarks are intended to make the process transparent.

1. Submitted manuscripts

The editors welcome manuscript proposals for all sections of ZF/SCH (articles, debate, sources, reviews). The scope and content of submissions should be compatible with the specific profile of the journal and comply with the requirements of each individual section (see the guidelines: <https://zeithistorische-forschungen.de/beitragen>). Please do not simultaneously submit your manuscript for publication in other journals.

If a submission meets the requirements of ZF/SCH, the executive editor will pass it on to the other editors (see <https://zeithistorische-forschungen.de/impressum>). Each manuscript is read by at least three members of the editorial staff and commented on internally. Decisions are made at the editorial meetings (held every two months).

In order to speed up the review process and to increase the chances of acceptance, prior submission of an outline (see attachment 1 below) of the paper is recommended.

2. Manuscripts for the ›articles‹ section (›open‹ issues)

If a manuscript receives a positive initial assessment by the editors, it will be anonymised and sent to two reviewers. The author(s) will be notified of this. In most cases the reviewers are members of ZF/SCH's [editorial board](#). Depending on the topic of the submission, other experts may be consulted. The reviewers evaluate each manuscript on the basis of a questionnaire (see attachment 2 below) that they complete and return to the editors (generally within four to eight weeks). The executive editor anonymises the two reviews and sends them to the author(s) together with the editors' comments.

3. Manuscripts for the sections ›debate‹, ›sources‹ and ›reviews‹ (›open‹ issues)

Manuscripts submitted for publication in these sections are reviewed internally (see point 1 above). If additional expertise is necessary, a member of the editorial board and/or an outside reader will be consulted.

4. Manuscripts for special issues (all sections)

Special issues are conceived and realised by two, three or four guest editors. These editors may be members of the editorial staff and/or the editorial board. General decisions about special issues are made by the permanent editors, the editorial staff and the editorial board. Manuscripts are specifically solicited from authors (based on outline proposals). After receiving the manuscripts, the contributions are reviewed (in a non-anonymised form) and commented on by all guest editors and the executive editor and then sent back to the authors with suggestions for improvement. A manuscript will be rejected if it does not meet the standards of ZF/SCH in terms of quality and/or content.

5. Address

Dr. Jan-Holger Kirsch
Leibniz-Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung
Am Neuen Markt 1
D-14467 Potsdam
Tel.: +49 (0)331/28991-18
Email: kirsch@zzf-potsdam.de
Internet: <https://zeithistorische-forschungen.de>

Attachment 1

Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History (ZF/SCH) Outline guidelines

1. What is the purpose of an outline?

Submitting a complete manuscript for publication in a journal entails effort and risk. It is therefore often more practical to contact the editors with a brief outline of the idea in order to find out whether the journal would generally be interested. In the event of a positive response, the author can begin writing the full manuscript (see point 3 below).

Although the outline should be relatively concise (two to four pages), it requires careful consideration and preparation. At ZF/SCH, outlines are read by at least three members of the editorial staff – historians with a broad spectrum of knowledge, but not necessarily experts in the specific subject area. The outline should therefore clarify:

- How the proposed contribution fits into the profile of ZF/SCH (cf. the articles already published on our [website](#))
- Which section it is intended for (articles, debate, sources or reviews)
- Why and how (if applicable) it fits into the context of a special issue
- Its specific academic merit and originality and its relevance to more general questions

The outline also serves as a work sample. If the topic is interesting but the text is not convincing in terms of content and style, the proposal will not be shortlisted.

2. What should an outline contain?

There are no formal requirements for the outline. In order to fulfil its purpose, it should, however, cover the following:

- The main research question(s)
- Relevant subject areas
- The sources used
- The structure of the contribution
- Possible hypotheses and conclusions
- A brief positioning in the research field and the contribution's significance for interdisciplinary discussions or broader discussions in the field of contemporary history
- Potential (audio)visual materials to be used and their expected cost
- Relevant exploratory work and the author's qualifications

3. Outline review procedure

The outline is discussed internally by the editors and the editorial staff. The author(s) will then receive critical feedback. In the event of a positive response, the author(s) can begin writing the full manuscript. This will be reviewed according to the guidelines outlined above (p. 1). There is no guarantee of publication based on the outline alone.

4. Literature

Rowena Murray, *Writing for Academic Journals*, 4th ed. London 2020.

Attachment 2: Review questionnaire**Peer Review Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History (ZF/SCH)**

Manuscript short title:

Reviewer:

Please evaluate the manuscript:

	+	+/-	-
Relevance for contemporary history	()	()	()
Academic quality	()	()	()
Originality of approach	()	()	()
Structure, clear argumentation	()	()	()
New/interesting findings	()	()	()
Fits into ZF/SCH profile	()	()	()
Language and style	()	()	()
Informative and compelling title	()	()	()
Supplementation with (audio)visual material is possible	()	()	()

The manuscript should:

- be accepted after minor editing
- be accepted after thorough editing
- be re-evaluated after thorough editing
- additionally be reviewed by another reader; suggestions for potential readers: ...
- be rejected

Peer review ZF/SCH

Manuscript short title:

(The comment should contain a first part with the reviewer's evaluation and, if applicable, a second part with suggestions for change. It should be formulated in such a way that it can be passed on to the author[s].)

Internal remarks for the editors and the editorial staff only: