REVIEWS

While suggestions for reviews are always very welcome, please do not send unsolicited book reviews.

Monographs and collective volumes are both eligible for review, but with a preference for monographs. Journals will be reviewed only if the first issue of a new series is published, or if there is any other reason for presenting a journal for the first time.

Reviews must be written in English; we can provide professional copy-editing by a native speaker.

**Length:** Up to 1,000 words for monograph reviews; for collective volumes with many relevant contributions, up to 8,500 characters / 1,300 words.

**Review copy:** The reviewer will receive a complimentary copy of the work for his/her private collection and use. However, please note that certain publishers provide access to electronic versions only.

**Deadlines for reviews:** Two months after initial receipt of the review copy.

**Impartiality:** A reviewer must have had no personal involvement in any work under review, for example as supervisor of a thesis, a colleague of an author working from the same institute or on the same project; nor should a reviewer be a contributor to the edited volume in question.

**Citations:** Excepting the editor of the volume mentioned in the publication’s title, the full names should be given in *italics* of authors contributing to collective volumes in order to make their citation easily intelligible within the text.

- As a rule, reviews should not feature footnotes. Should footnotes be deemed unavoidably necessary, the same rules apply as to the footnotes of a scholarly research contribution to *Südosteuropa.*
• If titles of single contributions within a collective volume or journal are mentioned in the review, then those titles should appear in full within single quotation marks, each time adding the page numbers in parentheses (without ‘pp.’).

• Quotations from texts must be within single quotation marks and should be referenced by adding the relevant page numbers in parentheses.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Please differentiate clearly between your summary of the contents and your commentary or critique. Contents, sources, argumentation and theses of reviewed works must be readily identifiable, critically discussed, and placed in the wider research context. The length of the contents and the commentary or critique should be proportionally adequate. We therefore suggest:

• Make sure your review ends with a clear evaluation and recommendation: refer therefore to quality, innovation, potential readership, relevance, significant deficiencies, etc.

• Discuss the position of the work under review within the canon of existing literature and theory.

• An outline of the structure of a work is always useful, but avoid describing or analysing the book’s content chapter by chapter.

• Explicit criticism of an author, authors, or publisher for insufficient accuracy and diligence (typographical or factual errors, etc.) is considered fair only if such flaws are structural.

When reviewing an edited volume:

• Avoid discussing or describing each contribution even briefly; instead it is preferable to select a representative contribution from each section.

• Avoid focusing in your review only on the best or worst contributions—treat all the authors, and the editors, fairly.

• In your evaluation you should always address the coherence of the volume, bearing in mind the stated intentions/ambitions of the editors.