

Peer-reviewed Policy

The policy outlined on this page applies to BUILT journal.

Selecting Peer-reviewers

1. Reviewer selection is critical to the publication process, and we base our choice on many factors, including expertise, reputation, specific recommendations and our own previous experience of a reviewer's characteristics. For instance, we avoid using people who are slow, careless, or do not provide reasoning for their views, whether harsh or lenient.
2. We check with potential reviewers before sending them manuscripts to review. Reviewers should bear in mind that these messages contain confidential information, which should be treated as such.

The Review Process

3. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review, typically to two or three reviewers, but sometimes more if special advice is needed (for example on a particular technique). The editors then make a decision based on the reviewers' advice, from among several possibilities:
 - **Accept**, with or without editorial revisions
 - Invite the authors to **revise their manuscript** to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
 - Reject, but indicate to the authors that **further work might justify a resubmission**
 - **Reject outright**, typically on grounds of specialist interest, lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretational problems
4. Questions about a specific manuscript should be directed to the editor who is handling the manuscript.
5. When reviewers agree to assess a paper, we consider this a commitment to review subsequent revisions. However, editors will not send a resubmitted paper back to the reviewers if it seems that the authors have not made a serious attempt to address the criticisms.
6. We take reviewers' criticisms seriously; in particular, we are very reluctant to disregard technical criticisms. In cases where one reviewer alone opposes publication, we may consult the other reviewers as to whether s/he is applying an unduly critical standard. We occasionally bring in additional reviewers to resolve disputes, but we prefer to avoid doing so unless there is a specific issue, for example a specialist technical point, on which we feel a need for further advice.