GUIDELINES FOR SERIES EDITORS

RIT Press owns several different series, each of which has at least one editor. Our series editors are experts in their respective fields and are responsible for several processes for the series they manage. This guide provides information on how our series generally operate and includes some best practices for editors.

Series Editor’s Role
A series editor’s role is to actively solicit, vet, and, as needed, help develop manuscripts that will be published in the series they manage. They are responsible for overseeing the peer review process, including soliciting peer reviewers and sharing reader reports with authors. They should also make efforts to increase visibility for the series and help market the series to prospective authors, which can be done in a variety of ways, such as giving presentations at relevant professional conferences.

Proposals and Manuscripts
Prospective authors should send queries and proposals to appropriate series editors. Ideally, proposals will include:

• A brief description of the book
• An outline and/or a table of contents
• A minimum of three sample chapters, including front matter, or the complete manuscript
• A list of proposed images and/or illustrative materials, along with a note about permissions for their use (with the understanding that seeking permission often takes time on the author’s part, and authors are responsible for the costs associated with these permissions)
• The estimated word count, number of images, and any additional materials such as appendices, bibliography, or charts/tables
• A list of two or three suggested reviewers for the author’s subject area, including contact information such as emails and phone numbers
• A completed Author Questionnaire (provided via email)

Series editors should also consider manuscripts in which authors cannot supply all of the above information at the time of the proposal. Authors should be encouraged to supply as many details as possible in their proposals. Series editors should discuss with prospective authors possible avenues for funding support for manuscripts they wish to pursue, which can be helpful in offsetting permission, production, and printing costs. However, a lack of funding support should not deter series editors from pursuing a manuscript proposal.

Series editors should make it clear to prospective authors that RIT Press does not accept manuscripts currently under review with other publishers.
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Peer Review Process
Series editors should seek at least two external peer reviewers for each manuscript intended for their series.

The peer review process is partly anonymous. An author’s identity can be shared with peer reviewers, as they may consider the contribution of an author’s work in their field, the place of the current manuscript in an author’s experience, and the reception of previous publications as part of the manuscript assessment. However, series editors should not reveal the identity of a reviewer to the author unless it is prudent to do so; for example, if a reviewer wants to reveal their identity or if it is helpful for the reviewer and the author to be in contact for additional consultation on revisions.

If a reviewer’s identity is revealed to the author, the series editor should first send the anonymous review to the author so as not to influence the author’s first response. After the author has had the chance to consider the report, the series editor can choose to reveal the reviewer’s identity to the author only with permission of the reviewer.

RIT Press reserves the right to request additional peer reviews as we see fit, including situations in which we are uncertain about a manuscript or editorial board acceptance of a manuscript based on a particular review, as well as in cases where the initial two reviews are widely divergent from each other. Likewise, we will determine the number of rounds of peer review needed based on the needs of the manuscript and on feedback from our editorial board.

Series editors should share anonymous reader reports with the author(s) and give them a chance to consider the feedback. Author(s) should write a response to the reviews in which they may explain why they disagree with any feedback or how they plan to incorporate revisions.

Series editors should share the reader reports as well as the author’s response with the managing editor of RIT Press, along with a letter of support for manuscripts they would like the Press to consider for publication. The managing editor will review the documents and share them with the rest of the Press team for discussion. If the Press is supportive of the manuscript based on the reviews and other pertinent information, the managing editor will share the documents with the editorial board for their recommendations.

Selecting Peer Reviewers
Series editors should select at least two reviewers to provide a reader report for each manuscript proposal received for their series.

Series editors may accept recommendations on reviewers from authors as a starting point, but they should seek at least one reviewer not recommended by the author(s) of the proposed manuscript unless there is strong evidence to support otherwise. If the series editor selects two reviewers from the author’s recommendations, they should consider seeking a third outside reviewer.

Series editors should prioritize soliciting reviews from scholars representing diverse perspectives and positions who are knowledgeable in the subject matter of each manuscript.

Series editors should rely on a wide range of sources to identify new potential reviewers, such as author recommendations, bibliographic databases, and personal research, in order.
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Series editors may consider several factors in determining which reviewers are appropriate for a manuscript, including publication record; tenure, innovative or leading ideas whether early or established scholars; or extensive teaching at a book’s intended level if it is intended for course adoption, among others.

Series editors should always err on the side of caution and avoid conflict or the perception of conflict in selecting peer reviewers.

Series editors should choose reviewers who do not have a close personal or financial relationship with authors; for example, authors’ relatives and dissertation advisors should not be chosen as peer reviewers, and neither should scholars who have contributed financially to any of the authors’ previous books or educational efforts. The series editor should avoid reports from close friends or collaborators (of both the series editor and the author), as well as members of an author’s dissertation committee.

**Additional Resources**
For further guidance, series editors may refer to the AUPresses Handbook *Best Practices for Peer Review of Scholarly Books*, from which some of this information was taken. It is available digitally: https://peerreview.up.hcommons.org/