

Peer Review Guidelines for Quærens

Recoletos School of Theology, Inc

Alondras St. Miranila Homes, Congressional Avenue,
Quezon City, Philippines

General Provisions

1. Quærens is a journal for theology and pastoral life. This is the wide spectrum for the article acceptability criteria for publication with Quærens.
2. Articles for Quærens publication is by invitation. Articles of internationally recognized authors may not go through review.
3. It is the discretion of the editor to determine the appropriate peer reviewer, on the basis of competence and availability, for articles submitted.
4. Quærens gives preference to the professors of RST as peer reviewers of articles submitted for publication. However, it also has a list of other theology experts who are called upon as the necessity arises.
5. The primary qualification of peer review is alignment with specialization.
6. The result of the refereeing may not necessarily be feed-backed to the author.
7. Referees may or may not sign their refereeing results and recommendations.
8. The referee is to give a written review of the article on the following points:
 - 8.1. Theological strength or contribution of the article
 - 8.2. Areas needing articulation and development (if given a grade of "2")
 - 8.3. Pastoral contribution or implications of the article
 - 8.4. Rate between 1-5 where:
 - 5 = Very Good
 - 4 = Good
 - 3 = For Publication
 - 2 = With weaknesses needing elaboration
 - 1 = Not fit for publication
 - (N.B.: The rate serves only the editor of the publication.)
9. The editor has always the final decision as to the article's acceptability for publication.

Commandments for Peer Reviewers

1. **Between Peers.** The role of the reviewer is almost like an extended editor. He reads the article on the level of aligned expertise. Thus a high degree of respect to the theological or pastoral perspective of the peer-author.
2. **Objectivity.** Theological logic is of primary concern. Avoid personal bias and theological prejudice nitpicking.
3. **Confidentiality.** The peer reviewer's contract is with the editor of Quærens not with the author. Thus, communication between the author and the peer reviewer is to be avoided or at best be made known to the editor.
4. **Professionalism.** Articles reviewed are not supposed to be used in any fora by the peer reviewer not until it's publication with Quærens.
5. **Positively Constructive.** In cases of theological conflicts, to be positively constructive is the option.
6. **Time Element.** Time is indeed precious. The amount of time devoted to peer review amounts to the respect given to the peer and to his work.
7. **Short Review.** Stick to the criteria set for this guideline in no. 8 above.
8. **Timely Submission.** If there is a possible delay in the submission of the review, it is highly recommended that the Editor of Quærens is properly informed.

Process and procedure for Peer Review

1. **Article Log-in.** Articles submitted for publication are assigned a reference number. Generally, this number corresponds to the Volume of publication and series number to which the article will be published (e.g Vol. 11; Series No. 2 [1]).
2. **Assigning of Peer-Reviewer.** The following is the order of priority in the assignment of Peer Reviewers: Quaerens

- Editorial Board, Professor of RST, Other Theology Experts.
3. Invitation by Formal Communication. A formal communication is forwarded to the prospective peer reviewer. The communication contains the following details:
 - 3.1. Deadline for the submission of the review,
 - 3.2. Criteria for the written review,
 - 3.3. Possible Date of article publication,
 - 3.4. Review Incentive,
 - 3.4. A word of appreciation for the service rendered.
 4. Submission of Review. Upon the submission of the review the review incentive will be given automatically. The Editor of Quærens will make the judgment on the possibility of the publication of the article.
 5. Printing of the article to the assigned date of publication.

Quærens Editor
(2016)

Sources:

1. Pehr H. Enckell. "Guideline on Good Refereeing Practice."
http://www.oikosoffice.org/sites/default/files/files/enckell_ref.pdf
2. http://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_guidelines_for_peer_reviewers_0.pdf
3. <http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-reviewers/guidance-peer-reviewers>