

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

- **Excellent = funding is highly recommended**
The proposed publication is among the best 5% in the field worldwide. It has the potential to break new ground and make a major contribution to knowledge.
- **Very Good = funding is recommended**
The proposed publication is among the best 15% in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally but minor improvements could be made.
- **Good = resubmission is recommended after revision**
The proposed publication is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses.

- **Average = before resubmission major revisions are required**
The proposed publication will provide some new insights, but has significant weaknesses.
- **Poor = rejection is recommended**
The proposed publication is weak.

Applications for new digital publication formats

- **Excellent = funding is highly recommended**
The proposed publication is among the best 5 % in the field worldwide. It has the potential to break new ground and make a major contribution to knowledge.
The applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess exceptional qualifications by international standards.
- **Very Good = funding is recommended**
The proposed publication is among the best 15 % in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally but minor improvements could be made.
The applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess very good qualifications by international standards.
- **Good = resubmission is recommended after revision**
The proposed publication is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses, and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess good qualifications by international standards.
- **Average = before resubmission major revisions are required**
The proposed publication will provide some new insights, but has significant weaknesses and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess sufficient qualifications by international standards.
- **Poor = rejection is recommended**
The proposed publication is weak and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, are insufficiently qualified by international standards.

Applications for scientific/academic journals

- **Excellent = funding is highly recommended**
The proposed journal is among the best 5 % in the field worldwide. It has the potential to break new ground and make a major contribution to knowledge.
The applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess exceptional qualifications by international standards.
- **Very Good = funding is recommended**
The proposed journal is among the best 15 % in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally but minor improvements could be made.

The applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess very good qualifications by international standards.

▪ **Good = resubmission is recommended after revision**

The proposed journal is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses, and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess good qualifications by international standards.

▪ **Average = before resubmission major revisions are required**

The proposed journal will provide some new insights, but has significant weaknesses and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, possess sufficient qualifications by international standards.

▪ **Poor = rejection is recommended**

The proposed journal is weak and/or the applicant and the team involved, if applicable, are insufficiently qualified by international standards.

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

	standardised reasons for rejection
C 1	<p>The review of your application was entirely positive. 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 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>

	standardised reasons for rejection
C 2	<p>The review of your application was predominantly positive. 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 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 largely positive. 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 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 partly positive. However, there were numerous points of criticism in the review, meaning that a substantial revision or re-orientation is necessary 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>

	standardised reasons for rejection
C 5	<p>The review of your application was predominantly critical. As it cannot be assumed that the weaknesses 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.