



A Guide to the Peer Review Process

What we require from authors

All submissions of articles, book reviews, conference papers, historiographical summaries, and conversational pieces should adhere to the guidelines set out in our “Types of Submission” document.

Authors **must** ensure that footnotes and bibliographies for all submissions conform to the style laid out in our Style Guide, which can be found here:

<http://www.midlandshistoricalreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Midlands-Historical-Review-Guide-for-authors-EDITED.pdf>. Our editors will check the formatting of footnotes and bibliographies during their proofreading, but they will not substantially reformat these.

Our editorial team can be contacted to provide guidance and advice on preparing your manuscript for submission at any time.

Please provide us with your institutional/preferred email address. If you expect to complete your studies in the near future, please ensure that we have an email address that we can contact you on in the event that your institutional address is deactivated. We also require authors to submit an abstract for articles/conference papers, a short biography, Twitter handle (if you have one), and keywords to attach to your published work.

Outline of the peer review process

- Submission received and read by Editor in Chief who approves article for peer review, or returns it for significant changes
- Articles handled by Lead Editor for Research Articles, and book reviews or conference papers by the Lead Editor for Other Outputs
- Lead Editor makes light edits, before passing onto three Assistant Editors in turn, who will peer review the submission, making corrections and comments as appropriate
- Lead Editor returns the reviewer’s comments to the author, who makes changes and takes on feedback
- Author signs the copyright form
- Lead Editor and then Editor in Chief do final read throughs, and the Editor in Chief approves article for publication
- Website and Social Media Editor uploads final article onto website



What to expect from the peer review process

All submissions will go through the peer review process outlined above. Authors should make submissions in the knowledge that they will receive feedback on their manuscript, and that the ultimate publication of their work is at the discretion of the Editor in Chief. Authors should be willing to work with the editorial team in order to produce quality publications that are both suitable for *MHR*'s audience and of a high academic standard.

Our editorial team will address spelling and grammar, including consistency in terms and punctuation, clarity of both the argument and details, and the structure of the piece. Below are some examples of the kinds of edits, comments, and feedback that you might receive.

We aim to provide constructive feedback and work closely with authors to ensure the quality and integrity of the piece. The examples below demonstrate the types of comments that you might receive, but note that feedback varies widely from piece to piece – you may receive more or less, and the length of the editorial process will similarly vary as a result.

- Making your own argument clear is key to articles and conversational (opinion) pieces, and we will highlight areas where we think this could be improved. You should not simply answer a question, or summarise other academic works, but make an original contribution to the field. Ways to make this stand out include signposting throughout the article, a clear introduction, and strong analysis. We may recommend reorganising paragraphs, or ask you to expand upon your existing work in order to achieve this.

<p>However, this narrative supports Wallerstein's hypothesis of the birth of modernity in the sixteenth century as a result of the emerging capitalist world-system. For instance, Wallerstein focuses on the decline of feudal Europe as the context to the emergence of modernity through the capitalist world-system in the sixteenth century. Wallerstein writes how we can view 'the crisis of western feudalism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the background for, prelude to, the expansion of Europe' in the sixteenth century.¹⁸ This illuminates a potential reasoning for Wallerstein's definition of the fourteenth century as a period of "crisis". Wallerstein is viewing the fourteenth century in comparison to the sixteenth century. Through this comparison, Wallerstein's interpretation of the fourteenth century is defined by the periodisation of 1500 and the sixteenth century rather than the period itself. This interpretation simplifies the period and overlooks many positive aspects of the long fourteenth century. Therefore, when evaluating the long fourteenth century academics must avoid defining this period solely in relation to the periodisation of 1500 and the sixteenth century as this overlooks historical patterns which transcended this periodisation.</p>	<p>Author Not entirely clear as to which narrative you are referring to here</p>
	<p>Author Expand on this further. What positive aspects are there? Why are they important? Make a place for your own argument as well as citing others- this will really strengthen the piece</p>



- We will also address the accessibility of the submission. As *MHR* aims to target students at any stage of their academic career, including undergraduate students, our publications need to be accessible to a non-expert audience. While articles need to be academically rigorous, they also need to be easily understandable and, therefore, should not rely heavily on the assumed knowledge of the reader. To mitigate this, we encourage authors to introduce key people, events, and places in one or two sentences, as in the below example, to provide context that the reader may not have.

Understanding the Holocaust in Hungary requires more than an exploration of anti-Semitism, as economic, nationalist and revisionist ideologies were intertwined not only with anti-Semitism, but also with a large degree of pragmatism. Widespread low-level anti-Semitism facilitated persecution, creating an environment of indifference in which persecution was considered socially acceptable. That persecution, however, was motivated by other ideological and pragmatic factors. Nationalism and to a greater extent Revisionism were pivotal in driving and shaping the character of the Holocaust in Hungary. However, ideology alone – however multifaceted – is not absolute in its importance. A significant amount of political, economic and personal pragmatism shaped the way in which Hungarians engaged with the Holocaust. A consistent willingness to use the Jews for Hungarian benefit is evident. They were pawns in international relations, particularly when in competition with Romania over Northern Transylvania. Furthermore, they were forced laborers supporting military action, and in everyday political, social and economic life. The roots of this willingness came from both ideological and pragmatic motivations: Hungary sought to recover political power, economic influence, and lost territories following the Treaty of Trianon. The ideological focus of intentionalist scholars and the contextual focus of functionalists is therefore insufficient in explaining the Holocaust

¹ Vera Goodwin, quoted in A. Kershaw, *To Save A People*, (London, 2011), p. 12.

1

Consider removing this part of the sentence. You essentially repeat it fleshed out with details throughout the remainder of the paragraph.

Author Deleted: acted to facilitate

Author
This assumes a considerable amount of knowledge. Perhaps add a few words to explain precisely what you mean by this, and a few words at the end of the sentence to indicate the ways in which nationalism and revisionism were pivotal. You don't do this until later on, so as it stands it is quite a basic statement that gives no clue as to how these will inform your argument.

Author
Whenever an event/person/law etc. is mentioned, always include a few words about them to give context. Here it could use something like, "following the 1920 Treaty of Trianon, which set peace terms between the Allies and an independent Hungarian state following World War I, including defining the Hungarian borders."

Author
This needs elaboration. Perhaps you could work mention and fuller explanations of these two approaches into the preceding paragraph where you begin to talk about Hungary in the broader Holocaust scholarship.

- We will assess all submissions for the quality and clarity of the writing style, and may make suggestions about re-phrasing, or even re-writing, elements of your submission to improve this. If English is not your first language, we have a team of editors who can work with you to ensure the clarity of your writing, should you wish to draw upon them/should we think it necessary.

tively higher-yielding colonial and foreign securities.⁶

This raises the question: what influenced the Norwich's perception of risk? Two barriers are fundamental in exploring the investments of the firm during this period. The first barrier is informational and the second can be grouped as ethnic, cultural and linguistic.

The development of information technology during this period was dismantling the first barrier to investment. The empire provided a field in which the perceived differences in ethnicity and culture were minimised, consequently stimulating a more substantial flow of information.

The importance of this research is its contribution to an ongoing historical debate over whether insurance companies conducted their investments in a manner which did not best benefit the British productive sector. The central allegation is that British financial institutions invested an undue portion of their funds abroad, forsaking the domestic business sector. Insurance companies had ever-increasing importance as institutional investors and as such the development of insurance companies' investment policies is significant within a broad set of issues concerning British economic development. Furthermore, this re-

Author
This sounds a bit strange – can you change to 'factors', or use 'barriers to investment'?

Author
Could you define this period more precisely?

Author
Sometimes you use the Oxford comma and sometimes you do not. Be consistent throughout.

Author
British Empire?

Author
I think this could perhaps be mentioned earlier – the introductory paragraphs read well, but they leave the reader feeling a little lost as to where the paper is going. I think more signposting and outlining the remit of the research, earlier on, would improve readability.