Peer Review Guidelines
Helsinki University Press

Please address the below issues in your review report. Do note that, If accepted for publication, the manuscript will be copy-edited by a professional, native English-speaking copy-editor. Please let us know if the manuscript needs significant editing for language and writing quality, but there is no need for you to address grammar/typos in depth.

- **Is the text competent from a scholarly point of view? Does it provide new information or data on the field?**

- **Does the work follow theories or methods that are relevant to the field? Is the author familiar with the essential literature in the field, including work by authors from marginalized or underrepresented groups?**
    - **If you consider the sources of the manuscript or their use to be lacking, please help the author(s) by suggesting relevant research literature.**
    - **Please inform the publisher if the manuscript repeats prior published materials to a great extent or if you have suspicions of plagiarism or find deficiencies in attribution of quotations/sources.**

- **Is the text a reasonable and meaningful addition to scholarly discussions and does it consider pertinent matters? Does it bring new perspectives to the debate?**

- **What is the target audience? Will the manuscript only be understood by researchers who are well versed in the field, or can it also be used by representatives of related fields? Could it be interesting for academics of other disciplines? Is it understandable for students of the discipline?**

- **Does the text fulfil the promises made in the introduction? Are clear objectives set for the text and does the author adhere to them?**

HUP HELSINKI UNIVERSITY PRESS

- **Does the author justify claims made in the text? Does the content of the text support the conclusions drawn?**

- **Is the structure of the manuscript clear and balanced, and is the content presented fluently and intelligibly?**

- **Do the titles and subtitles correspond to the content? Are matters presented in a sensible order and to the extent and level of detail demanded by their importance?**

- **Are there significant deficiencies in the text, or should certain elements be cut back or condensed? What are the most crucial corrections that must be made to the manuscript?**

- **If there are illustrations, what is the relationship between text and figures? If there are no illustrations or figures, should they be added for the sake of informativeness? If so, what kind?**

Edited Volumes

- **Does the manuscript form a cohesive and reasoned whole whose parts support each other?**

- **Please provide detailed comments on each chapter separately:**

The manuscript is acceptable:		**Yes**	**No**
	as it stands:		
	with minor revisions:		
	with major revisions:		
The manuscript is unacceptable and should be rejected:			

- **If you wish to include separate comments solely for the HUP editorial team and Academic Board, please include them here.**

Please let the Press know if you come across any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics.

Note that any possible conflicts of interest[1] should be taken into account in the review process. If a consulted expert has a conflict of interest related to the content or author(s) of a manuscript, or is in other ways involved with the matter, please contact HUP.

If you wish to know more about HUP's peer review policies, visit our website: https://hup.fi/site/peer-review-policies/

[1] The following are considered as reasons for conflict of interest:

- Co-authoring publications with one or more of the authors (past three years)
- Being colleagues within the same department/unit (past three years)
- Supervising/having supervised the PhD work of the author(s)/being supervised/having been supervised by the author(s)
- A personal relationship with the author(s) (e.g., family member, close friend, etc.)
- Personal/professional benefit resulting from the publication