

July 2021

Dimensions

Journal of Architectural Knowledge

Editorial Policy

[transcript]

Submission

Each manuscript should be accompanied by a cover letter which should explicitly state that the authors have the authority to publish the work and that the manuscript (or one with essentially the same content, by any of the authors) has not been previously published in any language anywhere and that it is not under simultaneous consideration by another journal. All authors of the manuscript are responsible for its content; they must have agreed to its publication and have given the corresponding author the authority to act on their behalf in all matters pertaining to publication. The corresponding author is responsible for informing the co-authors of the manuscript status throughout the submission, review, and production process.

Authorship

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Those who do not meet these criteria should be acknowledged in a footnote or referred to in the text.

The authors must ensure that anyone named in the acknowledgments agrees to being so named. The editors of »*Dimensions. Journal of Architectural Knowledge*« may require that the corresponding author obtains written permission from all acknowledged individuals.

Addition or Removal of Authors

An author's request for addition or removal of a co-author should be properly justified. Please note that a change in authorship (order of listing, addition or deletion of a name, or corresponding author designation) after submission of the manuscript will be implemented only after receipt of signed statements of agreement from all parties involved (all listed authors and the author to be removed or added).

Peer Review process

After submission to the e-mail address of correspondence (dimensions@bauhow5.eu), each manuscript is attributed an individual identification code by the Editorial Team, which will thereafter be used in all correspondence regarding the publication process. However, a submission may be declined by the Editor without review if the studies reported are not sufficiently novel or relevant to merit publication in the journal. Manuscripts deemed unsuitable (insufficient originality, non-relating to either the overarching subject of the journal or the specific topic of the respective issue, or of limited interest to the target audience) are returned to the author(s) without review.

Choice of reviewers

The Editors seek advice from suitable experts in the field. Research articles are refereed by a minimum of two reviewers. *Dimensions* allows for contributions in more liberal formats than traditional research articles and is explicitly aiming to broaden the spectrum of media and formats in academic publishing in architecture. Reviewers of an edition are invited to join the Board of Reviewers, which advises and supports the changing Editorial Teams according to the specificities of their respective editions.

An overarching coordination of the journal's content direction and negotiated topics is developed in close collaboration with the Advisory Board. Members of the Advisory Board are:

Isabelle Doucet (Prof. Dr.), Chalmers University Gothenburg
Uta Graff (Prof.), Technical University of Munich
Susanne Hauser (Prof. Dr. habil.), UdK University of the Arts Berlin
Klaske Havik (Dr. ir.), Delft University of Technology
Jonathan Michael Hill (Prof.), Bartlett University Collge London
Wilfried, Kühn (Prof.), Technical University of Vienna
Ferdinand Ludwig (Prof. Dr.), Technical University of Munich
Meike Schalk (Prof. Dr.), Royal Technical University of Stockholm
Katharina Voigt, Technical University of Munich

Suggestions from authors

Authors can offer suggestions for possible reviewers competent to review their manuscript. The reviewers make an impartial evaluation of the manuscript. Reviewers operate under guidelines set forth in the Guidelines for reviewers and are asked to comment on the following aspects of submitted manuscripts:

- Originality and significance of the contribution
- Approach and methodological coherence
- Strengths and weaknesses of the methods and argumentations used
- Coherence of the argumentation
- Relevance to the discourse
- Structure of the manuscript

If a manuscript is believed to not meet the journal's standards, is otherwise lacking in scientific rigor or contains major deficiencies, the reviewers will attempt to provide constructive criticism to assist the authors in ultimately improving their work. If a manuscript is believed to be potentially acceptable for publication but needs to be improved, it is invited for reconsideration with the expectation that the authors will fully address the reviewers' suggestions. Once all reviews have been received and considered by the Editorial Team, a decision letter to the author is drafted.

There are several types of decisions possible:

- Accept without revision

- Minor revision

- Major revision

- Reject

Revised manuscript submission

When the revision of a manuscript is requested, the author should return the revised version of their manuscript as soon as possible. Prompt action may ensure faster publication if a paper is eventually accepted for publication. If the deadlines set by the Editorial Team are not met and no specific arrangements for completion have been made with the Editorial Team, the manuscript will be treated as a new submission and will receive a new identification code along with a new registration date. The respective issue's Editorial Team makes the final decision.

Final proofreading

The author will receive a PDF file with the edited version of their manuscript for final proofreading. This is the last opportunity to view an article before it is published. No changes or modifications can be introduced once it is published. Thus, the author is requested to check their proof pages carefully against the manuscript within three working days and add all changes that should be introduced as comments to the PDF file. The author is sometimes asked to provide additional comments and explanations in response to remarks and queries regarding language and layout questions.

Immediate publication on the journal's website at open.transcript

Manuscripts ready for publication are promptly posted online. The manuscripts are considered to be ready for publication when the authors have accepted the final proofreading and all concerns have been resolved. Authors should notice that it is not possible to make any further changes once the article is published online.

Erratum

If any errors are detected in the published material, they should be reported to the Managing Editor. The corresponding author should send the appropriate corrected material to the Managing Editor via e-mail. This material will be considered for publication as soon as feasible.

Copyright

All authors retain copyright. The use of each article will be governed by the Creative Commons **cc-by** license. The corresponding author grants transcript Verlag the license for use of the article, by signing the author's agreement. A scanned copy of license should be sent to the Managing Editor of the journal as soon as possible.

Scientific Misconduct and other Fraud

»*Dimensions. Journal of Architectural Knowledge*« is committed to the highest standards of scientific practice. Scientific misconduct is defined by the Office of Research Integrity as »fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research«. In cases where there is a suspicion or allegation of scientific misconduct or fraudulent research in manuscripts submitted or published, the Editors reserve the right to impose sanctions on the authors, such as:

- an immediate rejection of the manuscript;
- banning author(s) from submitting manuscripts to the journal for a certain period of time;
- retracting the manuscript;
- alerting editors of other journals and publishers;
- bringing the concerns to the authors' sponsoring or funding institution or other appropriate authority for investigation

This journal only publishes original manuscripts that have not been published elsewhere. Multiple submissions/publications or recycled publications (re-packaging in different words of data already published by the same authors) will be rejected. If they are detected only after publication, the journal reserves the right to publish a Retraction Note. In each particular case Editors will follow COPE's Core Practices and implement its advice (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>).

PLAGIARISM**Retraction Policy**

Serious errors in a published manuscript and infringements of professional ethical codes (Cf. <http://publicationethics.org>) will result in an article being retracted. This will occur if the article is clearly defamatory or infringes legal rights of others; or if the article is, or if there is good reason to expect it will be, the subject of a court order. In any of these cases all co-authors will be informed about the retraction. A Retraction Note detailing the reason for retraction will be linked to the original article.

Conflict of Interest

In order to encourage transparency, all authors, reviewers and editors must declare any association that poses a conflict of interest in connection with the manuscript. There should be no contractual relations or proprietary considerations that could affect the publication of information contained in a submitted manuscript. A competing interest for a scholarly journal is anything that interferes with, or could reasonably be perceived as interfering with, the full and objective presentation, review, or publication of research findings, or of articles that comment on or review research findings. Potential conflicts of interest exist when an author, editor or reviewer has financial, personal or professional interests in a publication that might influence their scientific judgment.

Examples of such conflicts include, but are not limited to: Financial conflicts: stock ownership; patents; paid employment or consultancy; board membership; research grants; travel grants and honoraria for speaking or participation at meetings; gifts. Personal conflicts: relationship with editors, editorial board members, or with possible reviewers who have had recent or ongoing collaborations with the authors, have commented on drafts of the manuscript, are in direct competition, have a history of dispute with the authors. Professional conflicts: public associations with institutions or corporations whose products or services are related to the subject matter of the article; membership of a government advisory council/committee; relationship with organizations and funding bodies.

If reviewers have any conflicts of interests that could have influenced the reporting of the findings in their paper, they should disclose this to the Editorial Team. Such a statement should list all potential interests or, if such is the case, should clearly state that there are none. The editors may decide not to publish papers if they believe the competing interests may have compromised the work or the results, analyses, or interpretations presented.

Upon submission of a manuscript, authors may suggest to exclude any specific reviewers from the peer review of their article. It is the responsibility of the authors to disclose any funding sources for the project or other relationships that are relevant to the editors in the Acknowledgments section. Editors should reflect on whether any of the above competing interests are relevant to them and the manuscript under consideration. Those editors who believe a conflict might preclude their impartial judgment should disclose to the Editorial Team the nature of the conflict and decline to handle the paper.

Reviewers should reflect on whether any of the above applies to them and declare any competing interests. If they feel they cannot review a paper because of any competing interest, they should inform the editors immediately. If, for example, they have any associations with the authors of a paper, reviewers should declare this to the editors.

Commenting and Discourse

In order to provide the discursive context for scientific debate, readers are free to submit comments, questions or criticism about all articles published in the journal. Comments can be directly addressed at the authors, the editors, and the publishers. Readers are asked to find an appropriate form for their comments, sticking to the ethics of good scientific practice and relying upon constructive criticism. Comments may be declined if they:

- are irrelevant to the article
- are lacking cogency
- are incomprehensible
- appear to be advertising

Authors of all comments are requested to reveal all competing interests they might have with respect to the article.

APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

Appeals

Authors who want to appeal the rejection of their manuscript should contact the editors of the journal. Appeals should refer to scientific content of the manuscript and its suitability for publication. The decision made by the Editorial Team is final.

Complaints

Authors who want to make complaints should, in first instance, contact the Editorial Team of the journal. In case the Managing Editor is not able to resolve the complaint, the Authors should contact transcript Verlag directly.