

# Stand-alone Publications – Differences from the General Principles of Decision-making Procedures

## 1. Submission

Fundamentally as described in “General Principles of the Decision-Making Procedure”.

Applications cannot be made via the online portal of the FWF, but instead by submitting an original application and an electronic copy.

Each application is assigned to one Reporter. In certain cases (e.g., for interdisciplinary applications, or if a Reporter is particularly closely associated with the field in question), Alternates may also be nominated.

## 2. Minimum number of reviews

If an application is submitted with a publisher certified by the FWF, the publisher must provide two reviews that meet the requirements of the FWF.

## 3. Structure of a review

Fundamentally as described in “General principles of the Decision-Making Procedure”.

The differences in the quality standards for the formal assessment (rating) are as follows:

### Applications for publications with editing or foreign-language editing or translation

<b>Excellent = funding with highest priority</b>
The proposed publication is among the best 5% in the field worldwide. It is potentially ground-breaking and/or makes a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge.
<b>Very Good = funding with priority</b>
The proposed publication is among the best 15% in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally but minor improvements could be made.

<p><b>Good = resubmission with some revisions</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses.</p>
<p><b>Average = resubmission with major revisions</b></p> <p>The proposed publication will provide some new insights, but has significant weaknesses.</p>
<p><b>Poor = rejection</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is weak.</p>

### Applications for new digital publication formats

<p><b>Excellent = funding with highest priority</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is among the best 5% in the field worldwide. It is potentially groundbreaking and/or makes a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge.</p> <p>The applicant possesses – relative to the academic age – exceptional qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p><b>Very Good = funding with priority</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is among the best 15% in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally but minor improvements could be made.</p> <p>The applicant possesses – relative to the academic age – high qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p><b>Good = resubmission with some revisions</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses, and/or the applicant possesses – relative to the academic age – good qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p><b>Average = resubmission with major revisions</b></p> <p>The proposed publication will provide some new insights, but has significant weaknesses and/or the applicant possesses – relative to the academic age – fair qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p><b>Poor = rejection</b></p> <p>The proposed publication is weak and/or the applicant lacks sufficient quality by international standards.</p>

Reviews are not obtained for applications involving FWF-certified publishers.

## 4. Funding decision

Fundamentally as described in “General principles of the Decision-Making Procedure”.

Before the Board takes its decision, each application is discussed by the Commission for Stand-alone Publications, which makes recommendations to the Board. The Reporters responsible for the application present it to the Commission, taking into consideration the comment(s) of the respective alternates (if Alternates have been nominated), the respective proposals and the key points of the reviews received.

For the Stand-Alone Publications programme no bonuses can be offered.

The standardised reasons for rejection differ as follows

C 1	<p>The review of your application was <b>entirely positive</b>. However, the reviewers expressed even greater support for other applications. For budget-related reasons, the FWF can currently only approve those applications which receive the most favourable reviews and ratings; this means that your application could not be approved. If you choose to resubmit your application, please place greater emphasis on the strengths of the publication in order to improve your chances of approval.</p> <p>The choice of the publisher and/or the chosen form of publication were assessed as unsuitable. If you choose to resubmit your application, these aspects need to be considered.</p>
C 2	<p>The review of your application was <b>predominantly positive</b>. However, there were several minor points of criticism in the review, and the reviewers expressed even greater support for other applications. For budget-related reasons, the FWF can currently only approve those applications which receive the most favourable reviews and ratings; this means that your application could not be approved. If you choose to resubmit your application, please place greater emphasis on the strengths of the publication and take the reviewer’s suggestions into account in order to improve your chances of approval.</p> <p>The choice of the publisher and/or the chosen form of publication were assessed as unsuitable. If you choose to resubmit your application, these aspects need to be considered.</p>
C 3	<p>The review of your application was <b>largely positive</b>. However, there were a number of points of criticism in the review, meaning that your application cannot be approved in its current form. If you choose to resubmit your application, please focus on the strengths of the publication and take the reviewer’s comments and suggestions into account visibly and in a transparent manner.</p> <p>The choice of the publisher and/or the chosen form of publication were assessed as unsuitable. If you choose to resubmit your application, these aspects need to be considered.</p>

C 4	<p>The review of your application was <b>partly positive</b>. However, there were numerous points of criticism in the review, meaning that the publication would have to be revised and re-oriented substantially in order to be eligible for funding. If you choose to resubmit your application, please take the reviewer’s comments and suggestions into account visibly and in a transparent manner.</p> <p>The choice of the publisher and/or the chosen form of publication were assessed as unsuitable. If you choose to resubmit your application, these aspects need to be considered.</p>
C 5	<p>The review of your application was <b>predominantly critical</b>. As it cannot be assumed that the weaknesses in the application can be remedied within a short period of time, the FWF Board has decided that a resubmission to this funding programme will only be permitted after a period of 12 months.</p> <p>The choice of the publisher and/or the chosen form of publication were assessed as unsuitable. If you choose to resubmit your application, these aspects need to be considered.</p>

The Commission’s recommendations are presented to the Board for final decision.

## 5. Resubmissions and follow-up applications

Fundamentally as described in “General principles of the Decision-Making Procedure”.

In the Stand-Alone Publications programme, the term *resubmission* refers to the revision of a rejected application.

Where only one reviewer is contacted for an application, then either a previous or new reviewer will be called upon for a review.