

## **Peer Review process**

All Manuscript submissions are initially screened for appropriateness, before being reviewed by independent anonymous referees in a blind review process to determine whether the Manuscript can be sent to reviewers to make a final decision regarding publication accepted and published by SSR. Members of the editorial board or other qualified person can be selected as suitable referees for a particular paper. Author(s) may be invited to undertake revisions. Completed manuscripts that are accepted for publication will be published in the next issue of SSR. Manuscripts submitted to SSR must contain a high level of argument, coherent methodology, and solid research. Submissions should be approximately 3000-5000 words in Word format and be made by email to the editor, at [southernsemioticreview@gmail.com](mailto:southernsemioticreview@gmail.com)

## **Instructions for Reviewers**

### **Fair play**

An editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

### **Promptness**

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process. A two month margin is usually allowed for review.

### **Confidentiality**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

### **Criteria**

Publication of manuscripts containing a high level of argument, coherent methodology, and solid research, and making a contributing to their field, are encouraged. The journal accepts multiple methodologies and theory, and assesses work in as much as their articulate their own theory and method.

### **Standards of objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. A prose commentary up to one page is suitable for a review.

### **Acknowledgement of sources**

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument has been previously reported

should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

#### Disclosure and conflict of interest

Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

(adapted from Scandinavian Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychology (SJCAPP) guidelines)