

Reviewer guidelines

Baltic Worlds (BW) is a multidisciplinary journal that publishes scholarly articles in the fields of social science, humanities and socially-relevant technology and science. Its readership is both academic and non-academic, and is found both within and outside of Baltic Worlds' focus area (the Baltic region and the new Eastern Europe).

Submitted articles

The editorial board decides whether there is reason to not send the article for review. Scholarly articles are normally sent to two independent researchers for peer review before a decision is made about publication. All scholarly articles are submitted in English, which may be of varying quality. All articles that will be published are linguistically reviewed by the editorial board before being published.

BW's policy

Articles in BW should be readable and comprehensible, even to those outside the academic field. We strive to make the journal's contents multidisciplinary and to vary the articles' form. We avoid making articles too similar to one another. Obvious statements do not need to be supported by quotes.

Weighty introductions, explanations of why a particular subject is interesting or advance summaries of what the essay contains, repetitions of conclusions and important observations do not belong in a scholarly article in BW. Having the articles go through peer review before publication is a guarantee of quality. Both the author and the reviewers are anonymous to each other.

Academic reviewer - tasks

The authors have been given a Style Guide; the editors check that this is followed, but it is useful if the reviewer has also read it. The reviewer does not need to comment on the quality of the English, as this will be dealt with by the editors.

The reviewer's main task is to scrutinize the scientific quality of the article. The reviewer must send a written evaluation to the editors within a reasonable timeframe, one that is agreed by the reviewer and editors when the commission is presented and accepted. In this evaluation, the reviewer must present an opinion on the text's scholarly content, with particular reference to: relevance, originality, methodology, theoretical basis, thoroughness, precision and literary orientation.

The reviewer's task may be to suggest things that should be removed from the text, as well as additions, clarifications or the development of themes. The evaluation should provide the author with support in improving the article, and should include the text's strengths as well as weaknesses.

The statement should provide the editors with a recommendation as to whether the article, after any necessary revision, should be published or not. Choose from the alternatives: **a)** Reject (explain why) **b)** Accept with no revision **c)** Revision (major or otherwise).

If two evaluations are received with opposing opinions, the editorial board may decide to request additional recommendations from other independent reviewers. The final decision about whether to publish or not is always taken by the editorial board.