

## Guidelines for Reviewers of Working Paper Series Submissions

### Review Process: Double-Open Peer Review

The review process is conducted on a "double-open" peer review. This means:

- You will know who the author behind the contribution is.
- The author will also know who is reviewing his contribution.

We see the reviewing process as a mentorship. We prioritize care and mutual support over competition and isolation. Our double-open “care review” model fosters a guided, supportive dialogue that helps authors grow while promoting constructive feedback and mutual respect. This approach replaces stress and loneliness with collaboration and empowerment.

### Length and Purpose of Review

There is no required length for a reviewer report, but around two pages is typical. More important than length is clarity and constructiveness.

Please include in your review:

*A)* Classify the paper into one of the following categories:

1. Accept with minor revisions
2. Acceptable with recommended revisions (not mandatory)
3. Acceptable pending required revisions
4. Reject

Most papers fall into categories 2 or 3. If you suggest required revisions (category 3), you may later be asked to review the revised version along with a short memo from the author explaining the changes. Final publication decisions are made by the series editors. If you recommend rejection (category 4), please provide a clear justification for your assessment.

*B)* Briefly summarize the paper’s main thesis, the key arguments, and the types of data or theoretical materials used.

*C)* Explain how the paper contributes to existing scholarship:

- Is the approach or perspective original?
- Does it fill an empirical gap?
- Does it offer an original interpretation of a familiar topic?

*D)* Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the paper’s main argument, and any subsidiary arguments (as necessary).

*E)* Summarize your required and recommended revisions. You are also welcome to leave in text comments additionally to your summarized assessment.

*F)* If you have ideas or suggestions that could help the author develop the paper further - for example, toward journal publication or follow-up research - please feel free to share them. One purpose of the working paper series is to support and encourage ongoing scholarly development.

### **Language and Copy Editing**

If the paper requires considerable copy editing (for example, if the author does not appear to be a native speaker), please make this fact known to the series editors. The series can employ copy editors wherever necessary, and we ask only that you signal whether the paper you are reviewing requires this additional step. If you are not a native speaker yourself and do not feel comfortable assessing colleagues at this level, you are not obliged to do so.

Please submit your review to: [anpubl26@uni-muenster.de](mailto:anpubl26@uni-muenster.de)

Thank you for your time, commitment, and support of the working paper series. Your contribution is much appreciated!

Kind regards,  
Your Editorial Team