

Guidelines for the peer review process

TATuP - Journal for Technology Assessment in Theory and Practice is peer reviewed and open access, both online and in print. The journal covers the interdisciplinary scientific field of technology assessment, including related fields of research such as systems analysis, risk assessment, practical ethics, research on sustainable development, innovation and technology analysis, or foresight. TATuP addresses both an inter- and transdisciplinary readership.

TATuP's peer review process is non-blind and not public: the persons involved in the peer review process (authors, reviewers, editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, as well as, in the case of conflicting reviews, members of the editorial board or scientific advisory board) know each other by name and interact with equal rights in a fair and constructive way.

The central aim of the peer review process is quality assurance. The reviewers' comments support the editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, and editorial board of the journal in their assessment of manuscripts and include suggestions for their improvement. This also includes the reasoned rejection of manuscripts.

Reviewers are qualified by unbiased and proven scientific expertise in the field of the manuscript under review. This means:

- Peer reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any one of

the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts.

- All judgements and findings in the peer review process should be objective.
- Reviewers should sustain their critique by pointing to relevant published work which is not yet cited.
- Reviewers must treat all information from manuscripts under review confidentially before publication, or in the event that the manuscript is rejected.

Reviews and possible replies from the authors are not published.

The review process in detail

Only papers with thematic relevance for TATuP and in alignment with the author guidelines are reviewed. This is checked by the editorial team.

Selection of reviewers

Authors can submit a list of suggested reviewers together with their manuscript.

The editorial team, in case of contributions to the rubric Special Topic in cooperation with the editors of the Special Topic, chooses at least two external reviewers. External reviewers are those who are not members of the editorial team, the board of publishers, or the editors of the Special Topic and are acknowledged experts in the respective scientific field, in technology assessment in general.

Reviewers and authors must not be related in any way that might compromise the review's impartiality. This includes being employed at the same institute or currently working together in a project.

Reviews

The reviews have to be submitted to the editorial team by the announced submission date.

If two reviews come to opposing conclusions, a third reviewer may be consulted who, in this case, can also be a member of the editorial board.

The review includes an assessment of the paper, which should include, if necessary, constructive suggestions for the revision and improvement of the text.

The review also includes an assessment according to the following dimensions:

1. Scientific quality (the article complies with scientific standards)
2. Relevance (the article raises a current and in the respective context significant issue)
3. Substance (the article provides sufficient theoretical, argumentative, and, if applicable, empirical substance)
4. Style (language, figures, tables)

5. Novelty (the material used and/or the argumentation have novelty value)
6. Adequateness (the article fits thematically into the focus of TATuP and the Special Topic)
7. Audience (the article considers TATuP's interdisciplinary readership and is written in a comprehensible language)

The review results in a proposed decision, which distinguishes between the following levels:

- Acceptance without changes
- Acceptance after (major) revisions
- Rejection

Assessment of the review and further steps

The reviews are submitted to the editorial team who assesses and evaluates them, in case of contributions to the section Special Topic in cooperation with the editors of this Special Topic. The editorial team, or the editors of the Special Topic communicate the decision to the authors. Either the complete review or parts of the review can be forwarded to the authors.

Prior to a (final) rejection of a manuscript TATuP's editorial board can be informed.

If a revision of the paper is required the editorial team decides, in case of contributions to the Special Topic with its editors, if the revision has to be resubmitted to the original reviewers.

Overall, at least half a year is needed from the first submission of a paper until its publication in TATuP.

Identification of reviewed articles

If a reviewed paper is published, it is marked as "reviewed" and the date of the first submission as well as the date of approval of the publication are indicated.

Exceptionally, articles which did not go through the review process described above can also be published in the sections Special Topic and Research. These are of course not marked as peer reviewed.

A list of all reviewers is published in TATuP at the end of every year.

Version: 2020-02-04

Contact: redaktion@tatup.de

Website: www.tatup.de