

# Post-Publication Critiques

## Overview

In line with the [guidance](#) of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), *Perspectives on Politics* welcomes **Post-Publication Critiques** (PPCs) that generate constructive, scholarly discussion about previously published content and, thereby, advance knowledge in important ways. PPCs may center on the reliability of a published article's research design or analyses, concerns about research ethics, or other considerations about the validity of published research. PPCs must clearly articulate the concerns about the critiqued work and compellingly explain the implications of further dialogue on these concerns. Furthermore, PPCs must provide evidentiary support for all claims.

*Perspectives* will not consider PPCs that offer criticisms of scholarship published in other journals or venues. Furthermore, authors should be aware that submitting a valid critique does not guarantee publication. The editorial team evaluates PPCs not only for validity but also for the significance of their independent contribution to scholarly debates. Even if a critique identifies legitimate errors or concerns, it may not be published if the issues raised are too narrow or of limited value for pushing scholarship forward. However, all valid critiques will be shared with the authors of the original article. If, upon review, the editorial team concludes that a correction or retraction is needed, the authors of the original work will be required to acknowledge the work of the authors of the submitted PPC.

## Process

Upon receiving a PPC submission, the editorial team will conduct an initial assessment of whether the PPC meets a threshold of quality and relevance; submissions that do not meet this threshold may be declined at this stage. The editorial team will also ensure that the PPC adheres to principles of professionalism and academic integrity, avoiding any libelous, defamatory, or *ad hominem* content. If necessary, the editorial team might ask authors of the PPC to revise the submission to remove any inappropriate or unsubstantiated material. Once the editorial team establishes that the PPC meets these standards, it will invite a member of the Editorial Board to participate in the review process. This editorial committee will then determine whether the submitted PPC offers a constructive, thorough, and well-supported critique. If the editorial committee determines that the PPC offers a valid critique related to an issue of sufficient importance, then the journal will further consider it for publication.

If deemed suitable for further consideration, PPCs will be sent out for external review. Based on the reviews, the editorial committee will assess (a) whether the PPC is valid and meets basic standards, (b) whether it warrants publication in *Perspectives*, and (c) whether the issues raised may require a correction or retraction of the published work. The editorial committee will make one of three decisions:

(1) Reject the PPC because it is not valid or does not meet basic standards.

In this case, the PPC author will be informed of the decision and the process will end.

(2) Decline to publish the PPC in *Perspectives* even though it raises valid concerns.

The editorial committee may determine that, although the PPC raises valid concerns that should be addressed to maintain the integrity of the published record, its contribution is too narrow to warrant publication in *Perspectives*. In this case, the editorial committee will inform the PPC author of the decision. It will then share the PPC with the authors of the original article and request a response within three months. Because the PPC will not be published in this outcome, the original authors' response will be used to assess whether a correction or retraction is warranted, rather than for publication alongside the PPC. The editorial committee will then evaluate whether a correction or retraction is appropriate. This assessment may require sending the original authors' response for peer review (reviewers may be the same as those who evaluated the PPC, or new reviewers may be selected). If the journal plans to issue a correction based on valid concerns raised in the PPC, the PPC author will be notified in advance and offered the opportunity to post the critique as a working paper or on a platform that specializes in post-publication commentary (such as [Replication Research](#)) prior to publication of the correction. If a correction or retraction is published, the contribution of the PPC author(s) will be acknowledged.

(3) Continue with the review process of the PPC.

The editorial committee may conclude that the PPC raises valid concerns and that its contribution is significant enough to be considered for publication in *Perspectives*. In this case, the editorial committee will share the PPC with the authors of the original article and invite a response within three months. Authors may request an extension in writing, providing a justification such as the need for additional data verification or other extenuating circumstances; the editorial committee will assess extension requests on a case-by-case basis. If the original authors do not respond by the three-month deadline (despite sustained contact attempts), the PPC may be published without a response.

Once a response from the original authors is received, the editorial committee will determine whether to decline publication of the response, send it for external review, or accept it on the basis of the rigor of its analysis and/or argumentation. If the response is sent for review, reviewers will receive the original article, the PPC, and the original authors' response. The reviewers may be the same as those who evaluated the PPC, or new reviewers may be selected.

Given the assessment by external reviewers, the editorial committee will decide whether to accept the original authors' response for publication, reject it, or give the authors an opportunity to revise and resubmit the response. Assessing the results of the external review of both the PPC and the original authors' response, the editorial committee will decide whether to publish the

PPC without the original authors' response, publish the PPC with the original authors' response, or publish neither the PPC nor the authors' response. If it is decided that both the PPC and the original authors' response should be published, *Perspectives* will aim to publish both simultaneously.

As necessary throughout this process, the editorial committee will work to facilitate collegial, constructive dialogue between the PPC author(s) and the original authors. If, through the review of a PPC, the editorial committee becomes aware of unreliable findings resulting from major errors, fabrication or falsification; plagiarism; or unethical research practices, the original publication will be considered for correction or retraction in consultation with the Ethics Committee of the *Perspectives* Editorial Board.

The flowchart below illustrates the typical steps in our process for post-publication critiques. Actual procedures may vary at the editors' discretion depending on the specifics of each case. The diagram is intended to give PPC authors and original authors a general sense of how submissions will be handled; it does not indicate a strict sequence of steps that will be followed in every instance.

**Perspectives on Politics**

**Post-Publication Critique Review Process – Flowchart (Page 1)**



**Perspectives on Politics**

**Post-Publication Critique Review Process – Flowchart (Page 2)**

