**One More Voice**

Submission and Peer-Review Process

## Overview

*One More Voice* formally launched in June 2020. The project evolved in direct response to the coronavirus pandemic to give scholars easy-to-use, open-access materials for the classroom and to create an opportunity to publish new scholarship in a rigorous, but flexible manner.

Scholars preparing to contribute to our project should consult our pages on "Project Design"[1] and "Collaboration"[2] to get a sense of our overall publication approach and the wide variety of contributions possible. In short, we encourage creative scholarship. Such scholarship can take traditional forms, but we are also open to innovation. Our project's small-scale, artisanal approach also allows us to work with contributors in a more detailed way than usually possible.

*One More Voice* engages in a form of open peer review inspired by the practices of both the *Reviews in Digital Humanities* journal[3] and the *Debates in the Digital Humanities* book series.[4] The two-stage process makes authors and peer reviewers known to one another and centers on promoting knowledge exchange in a rigorous, but supportive scholarly environment. The goal is to produce high-quality scholarship that reflects well on both the authors and the *One More Voice* project as a whole.

Each essay published on *One More Voice* goes through one to two stages of peer review, depending on the needs of the author. The first stage is "in house," meaning that contributors already involved in the *One More Voice* project lead the process while focusing on the quality of the given essay from the perspective of a general academic audience. The second stage brings in one or more external reviewers who are invited to review the given essay with the goal of providing constructive feedback based on their domain-specific expertise. Any scholar with appropriate expertise is eligible to serve as a peer reviewer. However, the *One More Voice* project is especially interested in engaging scholars of color and other scholars who will help strengthen the project's commitment to diversity and inclusion.

---

[1] https://onemorevoice.org/html/documents/project_design.html
[2] https://onemorevoice.org/html/documents/collaboration.html
[3] https://reviewsindh.pubpub.org/review-process
[4] https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/. The *Debates in the Digital Humanities* website does not describe the process, but it involves three stages. In the first stage, individual volume editors peer review and select abstracts submitted by potential contributors. In the second stage, individual contributors peer-review one another's submissions; the volume editors also take part in this peer-review process. In the third stage, the given volume as a whole is sent for external peer review.

The project's two-stage, peer-review format grows out of the overall inclusive nature of *One More Voice*, works in tandem with the project's "agile publication" strategy,[5] and seeks to accommodate the needs of a wide array of scholars. For example, scholars at earlier stages in their careers and those going up for promotion and/or tenure may require a more comprehensive form of peer review and will opt for the two-stage peer-review process. Others – such as scholars at more advanced stages of their careers or those working at institutions that significantly prioritize teaching over research or those who have left the academy but still want to remain active professionally – may prioritize contributing to the critical literature on a given topic and will opt for the one-stage peer-review process. In each case, the decision is left to the individual scholar, with the overall goal being to enable scholarship that represents diverse individual and institutional (and non-institutional) perspectives.

## *First stage of peer review (required)*

This stage of review focuses on assessing the quality of the given essay from the perspective of a general academic audience; providing peer review in this stage is limited to existing *One More Voice* project contributors. The workflow is as follows:

1. An author independently approaches the *One More Voice* project team or is invited by the project team to write an essay on a relevant topic.

2. The author submits an abstract (250-300 words) that is then reviewed and assessed by two *One More Voice* project contributors. Feedback is collected and shared with the author; if necessary, a meeting is set up between the author and a member of the *One More Voice* project team to discuss the feedback.

3. Provided that the feedback is generally positive or can be comfortably addressed, the author is then invited to write the proposed essay and is assigned a time limit for writing the essay, usually two months.

4. Once the author submits the essay, one to two *One More Voice* contributors work with the author to review the essay carefully. *One More Voice* contributors normally suggest revisions to the text, raise points for further consideration, and assess whether the quality of the essay on the whole conforms to *One More Voice* publication standards. The process of revision is iterative and focuses on helping the author produce a publishable essay.

5. Once the process of in-house peer review concludes successfully, the author is given two options: a) publish the essay as is on the *One More Voice* project site or b) engage in a second round of peer review. Should the author choose the first option, the essay is published on the project site in a way that acknowledges that the essay has passed through the *One More Voice* in-house peer-review process.

---

[5] https://onemorevoice.org/html/documents/project_design.html - publication

### *Second stage of peer review (encouraged)*

This stage of review focuses on assessing the quality of the given essay from the perspective of one or more domain-specific experts. It will normally proceed at the discretion of the author. The workflow is as follows:

1. If the author of a given essay decides to take the essay through a second round of peer review, the *One More Voice* project team identifies a suitable peer reviewer and, if needed, an alternate or second peer reviewer. Authors are also encouraged to suggest suitable peer reviewers, but the final decision as to whom is or is not chosen remains with the *One More Voice* project team.

2. Once a potential peer reviewer has been identified, a *One More Voice* project contributor reaches out to the reviewer, outlines the *One More Voice* peer-review process, addresses any questions that may arise, and invites the given individual to contribute their expertise in reviewing and providing constructive feedback on the essay under consideration. Peer reviewers who agree to contribute their time and expertise are asked to: a) identify any concerns they may have about the essay and suggest how such concerns might be resolved, and b) provide any other constructive feedback on the essay deemed appropriate. Peer reviewers are given one month maximum to submit their written report.

3. Once peer reviewers submit their report, it is shared with the author, and the author is given the chance to revise the essay based on the feedback. At least one contributor from the *One More Voice* project is available to advise the author as needed during the revision process.

4. Once the author submits the revised essay, members of the *One More Voice* team review the essay to ensure that all feedback has been addressed appropriately. If necessary, any questions or concerns are raised with the author, and the author is given a chance to respond. As needed, this process is iterative.

5. Once the second stage of peer review concludes successfully, the essay is published on the *One More Voice* project site in a way that a) acknowledges that the essay has passed through the full *One More Voice* peer-review process and b) cites the name of the external peer reviewer.