

SATS – Northern European Journal of Philosophy

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

Articles should be written in English and formatted as PDF, RTF or MSWord files. Please submit papers directly to: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/sats>. (The Scholar One system produces a PDF file of each submission for editorial and review purposes.)

Information about the author should be written into a separate file. No explicit self-references are allowed in THE SUBMITTED ARTICLE, which MUST BE PREPARED FOR BLIND PEER REVIEW.

LENGTH: A contribution including references and notes should normally be within the limits of 20 pages or 8,000 words. Longer contributions may be considered, but additional length must be earned by the calibre and merits of the submission.

All articles should contain an ABSTRACT and KEYWORDS for indexing in English. Abstracts should be 100 to 150 words. UK, US or Canadian style and punctuation may be used, provided it is used consistently throughout the text (excepting quotations of works in English, which should be *verbatim*).

To inform contributors of SATS's editorial aims and expectations, our report form for referees is included at the end of these style guidelines (p. 3).

Quotation or CITATION with pagination should be indicated in the text using original year of publication as follows: (Royce 1927, 155), or: Royce (1927, 155). If a later edition or a translation of an earlier work is (also) used, this information is to be provided in the concluding section of References. (Contributors are expected to cite works in their original language(s), especially works in critical editions, though quotations may be in English translation. Quotations in their original language should have an English translation provided in a footnote to the quotation.)

If a cited work is divided (originally, by its author) into numbered sections (§, §§), citation by § number (*e.g.*: §3) is permissible and encouraged. If there are established conventions for citing well-known works these should be used; *e.g.*, Stephanus pagination (plus letters) for Plato's works, Bekker page + line numbers for Aristotle's works, or the two editions of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, cited as 'A' and 'B'. Titles of frequently cited major works may be abbreviated; *e.g.*, Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* as 'T'; Kant's first *Critique* as 'KdrV'. Citations by methods other than author (date, p.) should be explained in footnote to their first occurrence in the article.

Classic works with an original taxonomy of sections and sub-sections, such as Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* or Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature*, which are divided into (*e.g.*) Books, Parts, §§ or sub-§§, may be cited by the more recently established 'universal' reference method, by which a specific passage is cited by its paragraph number within the smallest sub-division made by the original author. Using this system, *e.g.*, 'Hume T 1.4.2.2' designates Book I, Part IV, §2, paragraph 2 of Hume's *Treatise*. Such references hold for any reliable edition or translation globally.

If desired, paragraphs may be designated using the symbol: ¶ (which may be copied out of this file, if your programme lacks it). In *no* case should '§' be used to cite any works not divided by *their* authors into numbered §§! (*E.g.*, it has become common to cite Hegel's 1807 *Phenomenology* by paragraph numbers, but these should be designated by '¶' or '¶¶', to avoid any possible confusion

with Hegel's *Encyclopaedia*, which he divided into numbered §§.)

FOOTNOTES are to be used rather than endnotes.

REFERENCES are given at the end of the article including all relevant information. Sample references are provided below. For purposes of original submission and editorial review, it suffices that the submission use one consistent, standard style and format throughout.

As part of the publication process, it is expected and required that the author edit the manuscript to conform with these style guidelines.

SAMPLE REFERENCES

Book, one author

Westfall, Richard S. 1980. *Never at Rest: A Biography of Isaac Newton*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Book, multiple authors

Kohlstedt, Sally Gregory, Michael M. Sokal, and Bruce V. Lewenstein. 1999. *The Establishment of Science in America: 150 Years of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*. Piscataway, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Reprint

Hume, David. 1740. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. London; P. H. Nidditch, ed., Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1975, 2nd ed.

Book Chapter

Friedman, Michael. 2003. "Hempel and the Vienna Circle." In: A.W. Richardson and G.L. Hardcastle, eds., *Logical Empiricism in North America* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press), 94–114.

Journal Article

Burian, Richard M. 1977. "More than a Marriage of Convenience." *Philosophy of Science* 44.1: 1–42.

Multiple Works by Single Author

McMullin, Ernan. 1985. "Openness and Secrecy in Science: Some Notes on Early History." *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 10.2:14–23.

———. 1990. "Conceptions of Science in the Scientific Revolution." In: D.C. Lindberg and R.S. Westman, eds., *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 27–92.

Translations

Duhem, Pierre. 1914. *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory*, 2nd ed.. P. Wiener, tr., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1954. Originally published as *La théorie physique, son objet et sa structure* (Paris, Chevalier et Rivière), 1906; 2nd rev. ed. 1914.

Menchú, Rigoberta. 1999. *Crossing Borders*. A. Wright, ed. & tr. New York, Verso.

Lavoisier, Antoine-Laurent. 1965. *The Elements of Chemistry*. R. Kerr, tr.. New York, Dover. Originally published as *Traité Élémentaire de Chimie* (Paris, 1793).

SATS – Northern European Journal of Philosophy

PEER REVIEW ASSESSMENT FORM

Ms. Title: “*”

Ms. ID Nr. *

Date: *

Advice: *

CRITERIA for evaluation: (these may be rated on a five-point scale: unworthy - excellent (1–5);
the use of points is not aggregative; the criteria are mutually independent): 1–5

How important is the topic addressed by the paper? —

Is the main thesis, point or conclusion(s) of the paper original or distinctive? Does the paper
contribute significantly to our understanding of the topic(s) and issue(s) it addresses? —

Does the paper provide significant, interesting, original evidence, analysis, examples or
arguments which clearly and persuasively support the paper’s main thesis, point or
conclusion(s)? —

Is the paper likely to be accessible to readers who have no great familiarity with the topic
discussed? (This is not to insist upon generality, but upon inclusive, exoteric presentation,
especially when sophisticated, specialized or technical considerations are used.) —

How well does the paper use the space it takes? Could or should it be more concise or
focused? If the paper is more than 8000 words, does it need to be? —

How well does the paper suit the aims and scope of *SATS* ? —

1 Quality of Writing: —
Excellent; Very Good; Average; Requires additional work prior to resubmission*; Poor.
* *e.g.*, careful editing by a skilled native speaker.

2 Relation to published literature on the topic: —
Presents significant new insights, results or arguments;
Provides an excellent synthesis and overview of current debate;
Derivative, yet could provide a useful contribution;
No significant contribution.

3 Quality of examination, analysis, argumentation or demonstration: —
Excellent ; Very Good ; Average ; Obscure, needs revision ; Poor.

4 Overall Evaluation: —
Should be published as it is;
Should be accepted, pending revisions along the lines specified below;
Should be revised and resubmitted for evaluation;
Should not be published.

5 Additional Comments: Reasons for assessments; detailed suggestions regarding possible
improvements (please add additional pages if wished)

5.1 Comments solely for the editors: *

5.2 Comments on the paper for the author(s) (*please ensure your comments can be forwarded
anonymously to the author(s) without editorial revision*): *