Peer Review Policy for Conference Proceedings

Transmedia Storytelling: Narratives, Discourses and Dissemination (TS'26)

Formatting Standards and Peer Review Policy: Summary

The conference **peer review policy** emphasises transparency, rigor, and ethical standards aligned with SCOPUS and Web of Science practices to ensure eligibility for indexing and publication.

All full-length submissions will undergo double-blind peer review by at least two independent experts not affiliated with the authors or the university. Reviewers shall evaluate the submissions on the basis of scientific merit/theoretical rigour.

Note: Details of Review Stages may be shared with authors of selected papers.

Formatting Standards

The research articles/ review papers must fit the scope of the conference and include essential headings that mark the flow of the content.

Use Times New Roman font, 12 pt size; abstracts limited to 150-250 words; full papers 6-12 pages; APA 7th edition for citations, as preferred by Springer interdisciplinary proceedings. Include keywords (4-6), author affiliations, and add ORCID iDs, if the paper is accepted for publication.

Ethical Guidelines

Plagiarism below 15% similarity allowed. The decision of the editorial board regarding acceptance of the paper will be final.

Peer Review and Ethics: Detailed Statement

The international conference on Transmedia Storytelling (TS'26) will follow a rigorous double blind peer review policy aligned with the expectations of Web of Science/Scopus–indexed journals.

1. Type of Peer Review

- The conference adopts a double-blind peer review system for all submitted abstracts and full papers, ensuring that both author identities are concealed from reviewers and reviewer identities are concealed from authors throughout the review process.

- All decisions are based solely on scholarly merit, originality, methodological soundness, and relevance to the conference theme of Transmedia Storytelling.

2. Editorial Screening and Scope Check

- Each submission undergoes an initial screening by the Conference Editorial Committee to verify:
    - Fit with the conference theme and tracks.
    - Compliance with formatting, ethical, and language requirements.
    - Absence of plagiarism and redundant publication.
- Submissions that fail to meet basic standards or fall outside scope may be rejected at this stage without external review.

3. Anonymisation Requirements (For Full-paper submissions post-presentation)

- Authors must submit complete manuscripts in anonymised form, removing:
    - Names, affiliations, email addresses, acknowledgements, self-identifying references, and metadata from the document file.
- The Editorial Committee checks anonymisation before assigning reviewers to preserve the integrity of the double-blind process.

4. Reviewer Selection and Number of Reviews

- Each eligible submission is sent to at least two independent reviewers, selected for their expertise in literary studies, media studies, cultural studies, digital humanities, management or related areas of transmedia storytelling.
- Reviewers are drawn from a diverse pool of national and international scholars to minimise institutional, geographic, and disciplinary bias.

5. Review Criteria and Recommendations

Reviewers evaluate submissions against a structured rubric, typically including:

- Originality and contribution to knowledge in transmedia storytelling.
- Theoretical and methodological rigor.

- Clarity of argument, organisation, and use of evidence.

- Relevance to conference themes and track objectives.

- Quality of language and adherence to ethical norms.

Reviewers recommend one of the following decisions: accept, accept with minor revisions, revise and resubmit, or reject.

6. Decision-Making and Revisions

- Final decisions are taken by the Conference Editorial Committee (and, where required, series editor/Atlantis Press editor) based on reviewers' reports and the overall programme balance.

- For papers invited with revision, authors must:

    - Address reviewer comments point-by-point.

    - Submit a revised anonymised manuscript and a response note within the stipulated deadline.

7. Ethics, Confidentiality, and Conflict of Interest

- Reviewers must treat manuscripts as confidential documents and must not share, cite, or use the work prior to publication.

- Reviewers and editors are required to declare any conflicts of interest (institutional, collaborative, or personal). Where a conflict exists, the manuscript is reassigned.

- Any suspected plagiarism, duplicate publication, or ethical breach (including data fabrication, inappropriate image manipulation, or research misconduct) will be handled in accordance with standard publishing ethics guidelines and may lead to rejection and notification of relevant bodies or publishers.

- Only papers that successfully pass this double-blind peer review process and comply with ethical and formatting standards will be forwarded for inclusion in the conference proceedings to be considered for indexing in Web of Science and/or Scopus.

- NB: Those quality papers which fall outside the above paradigm would be considered for inclusion in an ISBN book.