

## ***Global Discourse* Book Review Section: Author Submission Guidelines**

### ***Background***

Academic book reviewing has become a seriously endangered art. For too long, it has been painfully obvious that reviews are used chiefly to pad out journal content. Among the factors that prevent the *genre* from being taken seriously are inadequate word-limits for the development of a sustained argument, the lack of stringent peer-review processes and the tendency for completed reviews to await publication for longer than it takes the average academic to write a book.

In response, *Global Discourse* has sought to deploy interdisciplinary, discursive review symposia, in which books are subject to a series of reviews and a reply by the author. Symposia have featured the work of such figures as Noam Chomsky, Andrew Linklater and Cynthia Weber, Guy Standing, Mark Purcell, David Graeber, Michael Shapiro, Axel Honneth, Bruno Latour and Graham Harman, Stuart Elden, Nadia Urbinati, Wil Verhoeven, Jason Stanley, Madawi Al-Rasheed and James A. Harris.

### ***Guidance***

Appreciating the potential of reviews to contribute to their respective fields, *Global Discourse* publishes review symposia on the latest monographs of relevance to the themes of our issues. These symposia feature up to five reviews of between 1,000-3,000 words and an author's reply of up to 5,000 words. We follow the [\*London Review of Books\*](#) in promoting good style and [\*Political Studies Review\*](#) in advancing intellectual rigour.

Reviews do not merely reconstruct, but actively examine in depth, the core claims and implications of the work at hand. Our preference is for pieces that focus on intensive exploration of specific elements of the monograph at hand. Exposition is required only in order to enable that substantive examination and we actively reject pieces that consist overwhelmingly of reconstruction. At the same time, we do not publish polemics. Reviews ought to be considered assessments, advanced in reasoned, measured tone, of the various merits of a piece. In particular, we encourage submissions that apply theoretical content to real world issues.

The longer the submission, the more the piece must go beyond exposition and engage with other literatures, meaning that 2,000-3,000 is the transition point between an extensive review and a 5,000 word review article on several monographs. Review articles should only be submitted in instances in which a review of the subject of a symposium requires substantive examination of related literature. Given that space is of a premium, we reserve the right to request condensation during the peer-review process if it is felt that the key arguments of the piece can be articulated more concisely. Reviewers ought to aim for around 1,000 words for a review consisting of two main points of critique of a single monograph, extending upwards according to the number of points of critique and literatures engaged.

*Book reviews* should be no less than 1,000 and no more than 3,000 words, including tables, references, figure captions, footnotes, endnotes. *Review articles* and *author's replies to reviews* should be no more than 5,000 words, including tables, references, figure captions, footnotes, endnotes.

Reviews must conform to the journal's [house style](#).

### ***Process***

We aim to publish reviews online within four months of a reviewer's receiving the book. This timeframe is critical to the journal's aim of supporting timely publication of reviews. Reviewers have two months, from the date of receipt, to read it and produce and submit a first draft of

the review to the Book Reviews Editor, Rosamund Mutton ([r.v.mutton@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:r.v.mutton@lancaster.ac.uk)). Reviewers will receive a reminder email two weeks before the deadline. If, having read the book, reviewers deem it unworthy of review, it is essential that the Book Reviews Editor be informed so that they can 'stop the clock' and cancel any further follow up emails.

The Book Reviews Editor, in conjunction with referees selected from the Editorial Advisory Board, then has two weeks in which to review submissions with regard to considerations noted above. Authors will be notified, within two weeks, of the outcome of that review. The possible outcomes are: accept, accept with revisions or reject. Authors will receive referees' comments at this stage. Authors asked to revise and resubmit their piece are given two weeks in which to complete any revisions and to ensure that their submission conforms to house style. The Book Reviews Editor will review the resubmission at this point and confirm conditional acceptance or request further revisions within two days of receiving the revised review.

All conditionally accepted pieces must be submitted through the Editorial Manager portal, which will be available shortly. For information about what this should include, please [see the journal's instructions for authors](#) (section: 'Editorial Manager'). Pieces will undergo a standard copy-editing process, and authors will receive proofs of manuscripts that will include a list of 'author queries'. Authors are asked to reply to these queries within three days of receipt.

All accepted articles will feature in the fast-track (online first) section prior to being allocated to an online issue. Most reviews will be held over until the final issue of each volume.

### ***Submissions***

Please liaise with the Book Reviews Editor, Rosamund Mutton, by email in advance of submission.

Rosamund Mutton  
Politics, Philosophy and Religion  
County South  
Lancaster University  
Bailrigg  
Lancaster  
United Kingdom  
LA1 4YL  
Email: [r.v.mutton@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:r.v.mutton@lancaster.ac.uk)