GLQ Guidelines for Special Issue Proposals

Special Issue proposals will undergo a peer review process for acceptance at GLQ. We will aim to publish one special issue per year. The Coeditors will determine the suitability of a Special Issue proposal to be reviewed for publication in the journal. An Associate Editor will serve as one reviewer, and we will also send the proposal out to one additional reader.

Special Issue proposals should be submitted to the journal’s email address (dup_glq-editor@duke.edu). They should include the title of the proposed issue, the names of all proposed Guest Editors, and a 500-word description of the issue, which should argue for the relevance of the issue for GLQ and cite the work on which it is building. In addition, a draft call for submissions should be included, as well as a list of proposed authors and articles, if one exists.

Generally, we discourage Special Issue proposals based on organized events such as conferences, symposia, or fora; we expect that a Special Issue call will speak to the field more broadly and open itself to contributions beyond those who were able to be physically present at an event. All Special Issues will undergo an open call process, which will be circulated to the readership of GLQ. It is at the Guest Editors’ discretion to include any of these submissions in the proposed issue. One of the Coeditors will work with each group of Guest Editors to develop the final submission to the press. This Coeditor has discretion to accept, reject, and request changes of any material submitted.

Special Issues typically take up to two years to see print. Proposals will be reviewed in our regular cycle, and may take up to three months to receive a response. Proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Is this topic significant enough to warrant dedicating an entire issue (or double issue) of the journal?

2. Do the proposed Guest Editors address the topic within the current state of the field, and are they referencing the scholars who should be engaged in the proposed conversation?

Have the proposed Guest Editors framed the topic in a way that enriches its engagement within queer theory? What contribution does this proposal stand to bring to queer theory/studies in general?