Master File: Templates

Contents

A.

Editor Assign

Dear {$editorialContactName}:

The submission, "{$submissionTitle}," to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*
has been assigned to you to see through the editorial process in your role as first/second editor.

Submission URL: {$submissionUrl}

Username: {$editorUsername}

Thank you,

Amanda

B.

Pass Pre-review

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you very much for your submission to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We have pre-reviewed your manuscript and decided to forward it on for blind peer review. We hope to arrive at an initial editorial decision within four months, but this may vary depending on reviewer availability. We will contact you as soon as a decision has been made. Meanwhile, we will appreciate it if you could send us the names of a few scholars who you think would be good reviewers for this paper.

{$editorialContactSignature}

C.

Editor Decision Initial Decline

Dear {$authorName}:

We write concerning, "{$submissionTitle}", which you submitted to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. The Editorial Collective (EC) has now reviewed your submission and has decided to decline your manuscript.

While your paper [VVV], we don't feel that [YYY or ZZZ]. Given your references, we think the manuscript might be better suited to [Journal Title] or a journal focused on [Some Topic].

Thank you for considering *ESTS* for your work. We wish you the very best with its publication.

{$editorialContactSignature}

D.

Editor Decision Decline

Dear {$authorName}:

We write concerning "{$submissionTitle}," which you submitted to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. Based on the attached reviews, the Editorial Collective (EC) has now considered your submission and has decided to decline your manuscript.

While your paper [VVV], we don't feel that [YYY or ZZZ]. Given your references, we think the manuscript might be better suited to [Journal Title] or a journal focused on [Some Topic].

Thank you for considering *ESTS* for your work. We wish you the very best with its publication.

{$editorialContactSignature}

E.

Editor Decision Resubmit

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you again for submitting your article, "{$submissionTitle}," to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS).* We have reviewed your most recent submission and, based on the attached reviews, we have decided to ask that you revise the manuscript and resubmit for review

While your paper [VVV], we don't feel that [YYY].

Please let us know your anticipated timeline for submitting a revised manuscript along with a letter detailing how you have addressed reviewer comments. Thank you again for considering *ESTS* for your work.

{$editorialContactSignature}

F.

Editor Decision Revisions

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you again for submitting your article, "{$submissionTitle}," to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We have reviewed your most recent submission and, at this stage, we are asking you to address a few more issues in full before accepting the manuscript for publication.

First, we'd like your conclusion to….

Relatedly, we'd like to hear more about… in ….

Finally, xxx

Please let us know your anticipated timeline for submitting a revised manuscript. We would love to have your manuscript back within four weeks. Let us know, too, if you have any questions.

Thank you again for considering *ESTS* for your work. We look forward to seeing what we hope is a final round of revisions.

{$editorialContactSignature}

G.

Editor Decision Accept

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you again for submitting your article, "{$submissionTitle}," to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We have reviewed your most recent submission and believe that you have successfully incorporated reviewer and editor comments in the revised manuscript. The manuscript now makes a clear contribution that advances STS scholarship, and as such, we are delighted to accept the manuscript for publication in *ESTS*.

Your manuscript will now be moved into the production phase. The managing editor will write to you soon with further information and follow up requests.

{$editorialContactSignature}

H.

Article Review Acknowledgment

Dear {$reviewerName}:

Thank you for completing the review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We appreciate your contribution to the quality of the work that we publish.

{$editorialContactSignature}

I.

Review Request Canceled

Dear {$reviewerName}:

We have decided at this point to cancel our request for you to review the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you and hope that we will be able to call on you to assist with the journal's review process in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

{$editorialContactSignature}

J.

Review Complete

Dear Editors:

I have now completed my review of "{$submissionTitle}" for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*, and submitted my recommendation, "{$recommendation}."

{$reviewerName}

K.

Review Confirm

Dear Editors:

I am able and willing to review the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. Thank you for thinking of me, and I plan to have the review completed by its due date, {$reviewDueDate}, if not before.

{$reviewerName}

L.

Review Decline

Dear Editors:

I am afraid that at this time I am unable to review the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. You may consider the following as potential reviewers for this submission instead: [PLEASE INCLUDE REVIEWER NAMES AND CONTACT INFO HERE].

Thank you for thinking of me, and another time feel free to call on me.

{$reviewerName}

M.

Review Remind

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This is a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle},"
for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We were hoping to have this review by
{$reviewDueDate}, and would be pleased to receive it as soon as you are able to prepare it.

If you do not have your username and password for accessing the ESTS website. You can use
this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username).
{$passwordResetUrl}

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Please confirm your ability to complete this vital contribution to the work of the journal. We look
forward to hearing from you.

{$editorialContactSignature}

N.

Review Request

REVIEW_REQUEST

Dear {$reviewerName}:

We are writing to inquire whether you would be willing to review the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* (*ESTS*) which was submitted under the [insert genre name] genre to the journal. An abstract for the manuscript is included at the end of this message.

Published by The *Society for Social Studies of Science* (4S), *ESTS* is a vibrant, fully open access journal for cultivating, evaluating, and sharing cutting-edge research in the social studies of science, technology, and medicine in transnational contexts. The current editorial team of *ESTS* is especially committed to: diversifying the geographical base of the journal; strengthening Open Access infrastructure; innovating genre-forms and content; and cultivating sustained attention to pedagogy in STS scholarship. You can read more about our editorial vision on our website.

We rely on reviewers in helping us realize our editorial commitments. Appended below are some questions we would like you to consider while evaluating the submission. Please feel free to respond beyond or outside of these questions as well, if you think a fair review of the manuscript requires that. We are also appending brief descriptions of various genres that *ESTS* publishes, and you can find more information about these on our website.

We believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript and we request that you consider undertaking this important task for us. We realize reviewing a manuscript puts demands on your time, but we hope that you share our view that a critical and constructive assessment of papers is essential in maintaining the quality of the journal and professional standards in the field.

We seek to turn around manuscripts quickly, but responsibly. Our goal is to have reviewers return their assessments within 4 weeks. However, if this timeframe won't work for you, we would be happy to learn what would and to try to work with you. If you are not able to do a review for us, we would appreciate your suggestions of other scholars who would be good for

the job.

Please confirm your willingness to review by logging into our [online system](#) by {$responseDueDate}.

Your review of the submission, along with your recommendation (including a decline to review), should be submitted via our online system by {$reviewDueDate}.

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Editorial Team

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$abstractTermIfEnabled}

{$submissionAbstract}

Reviewer Guidelines

Please consider the following questions in framing your review comments.

- Is the topic sufficiently engaging and important to warrant publication in *ESTS*?
- What are the main contributions of this paper to STS? Please note that contributions can take several forms: conceptual advancement, adding to the empirical record, and methodological and/or pedagogical innovation, for example.
- Is the main argument clearly supported with specific examples and evidence, clearly situated within its context considering an international readership, and grounded in STS

theory and practice? Are possible ways offered for drawing on or extending the analysis in other contexts?

- For **thematic collections**: Does the submission clearly contribute to the thematic collection's overall focus? How can the submission's connections to the thematic collection's overall focus be further strengthened or explicated?
- Is the submission clearly written and properly structured? Are there any parts of the manuscript that should be expanded or condensed? Please note that authors may not be native English speakers: we are asking reviewers to evaluate manuscripts for the clarity of their argument and not for English proficiency. Please direct your comments accordingly.
- Are there exclusions of relevant literature and scholars in this submission? If so, how might these be addressed?
- Have the authors discussed if and how they will share the data used in their manuscript with other researchers or the public (e.g. for further use for research or pedagogical purposes by others)? If so, how? If not, are there opportunities for opening access to their data indicated by the manuscript?
- Does the form of presentation in manuscript align with the content that is being presented? How can the fit between form and content for this submission be strengthened? Do you see opportunities within the manuscript or in the form of supplemental material to engage multi-modal formats?
- Do you see opportunities within the manuscript or as supplemental material that could enhance the pedagogical value of this submission?
- Please provide any other comments that might help us evaluate the manuscript.

Genre Descriptions

Original Research Articles

- Single- or co-authored individual research articles.
- Double-blind peer reviewed by default.
- Here we will consider theoretical papers and empirical studies.
- Target limit: 9k words including notes, excluding references.

Thematic Collections

- ESTS's language for "special issues."
- Can include submissions from across genres.
- Proposals for thematic collections typically pre-reviewed by *ESTS* EC for fit, relevance, and timeliness.

Engagements

- 2k-6k words

- Experiments with the form of presenting STS scholarship.
- Can take multiple forms including, but not limited to: **debates/interactions** (commentaries on essays published in *ESTS*), **review essays** (reviewing themes significant to STS scholars and beyond), **pedagogical interventions/exemplars**, **making and doing multimodal essays**. Please refer to *ESTS* archives for examples of diverse writing in genre forms.
- Can be outward-facing (i.e. undertaking STS analyses on diverse issues) or inward-facing (i.e. reflecting on the field of STS itself).

Perspectives

- Less than 2k words.
- Synthesize STS perspectives on important contemporary issues for a broader audience.
- Reviewed by EC and maybe someone from the Editorial Board.

{$editorialContactSignature}

O.

Revised Version Notify

Dear Editors:

A revised version of "{$submissionTitle}" has been uploaded by the author {$authorName}.

Submission URL: {$submissionUrl}

{$editorialContactSignature}

P.

Revisions Received

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you for submitting your revision of the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}" to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS).* With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal website:

Manuscript URL: {$submissionUrl}

Username: {$authorUsername}

For further details about our decision-making process, please consult our, please consult our [editorial policies](#) and [submission guidelines](#) on the journal website.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering *ESTS* for the publication of your work.

{$editorialContactSignature}

Q.

Review Request for a Revised Submission

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This regards the manuscript "{$submissionTitle}," which is under consideration by *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*.

Following the review of the previous version of the manuscript, the authors have now submitted a revised version of their paper. We would appreciate it if you could help evaluate it.

Please log into the journal website by {$responseDueDate} to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation. The website is {$contextUrl}.

The review itself is due by {$reviewDueDate}.

If you do not have your username and password for the journal's website, you can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username): {$passwordResetUrl}.

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for considering this request.

{$editorialContactSignature}

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$abstractTermIfEnabled}

{$submissionAbstract}

Templates R-Z are additional templates we do need the system to keep.

R.

Journal Registration

USER_REGISTER

Dear {$userFullName}:

Welcome! You are now registered as a user with {$contextName}. Your username and password (below) are needed for all online work with *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* through its website. At any point, you can ask to be removed from the *journal's* list of users by emailing: estsjournal@gmail.com. Please subscribe to our newsletter and via Twitter.

Username: {$username}

Password: {$password}

If you are interested in submitting to *ESTS*, please read our editorial policies sections of the website so that you can identify how your original material fits into our genres. Then, please review our submission guidelines to understand how to prepare your manuscript for submission.

{$editorialContactSignature}

S.

Author Submission Acknowledgement

SUBMISSION_ACK_NOT_USER

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}" to Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS). With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging into the journal website:

Manuscript URL: {$submissionUrl}

Username: {$authorUsername}

We would like for you to be aware of the following next steps:

SUBMISSIONS BASICS: All new submissions will be checked to ensure that they have met the basic requirements for submission (such as word limits, permissions to use data/imagery, Chicago style, thoroughness and appropriate formatting of bibliographic references, document formatting, data/imagery specifications, author anonymity, etc).

PRE-REVIEW: After the basics are approved, submissions will then go into a phase of substantive pre-review during which editors will thoroughly read and discern whether the submission is appropriate for ESTS. Authors should expect a pre-review decision within two weeks of submission.

If you are still in need of details, please consult our editorial policies and submission guidelines as shown in the about section of the journal website.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering ESTS for the publication of your work.

{$editorialContactSignature}

T.

Submission Acknowledgement

SUBMISSION_ACK

Dear {$authorName}:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}" to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging into the journal website:

Manuscript URL: {$submissionUrl}

Username: {$authorUsername}

We would like for you to be aware of the following next steps:

SUBMISSIONS BASICS: All new submissions will be checked to ensure that they have met the basic requirements for submission (such as word limits, permissions to use data/imagery, Chicago style, thoroughness and appropriate formatting of bibliographic references, document formatting, data/imagery specifications, author anonymity, etc).

PRE-REVIEW: After the basics are approved, submissions will then go into a phase of substantive pre-review during which editors will thoroughly read and discern whether the submission is appropriate for *ESTS.* Authors should expect a pre-review decision within two weeks of submission.

If you are still in need of details, please consult our editorial policies and submission guidelines as shown in the about section of the journal website.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering *ESTS* for the publication of your work.

{$editorialContactSignature}

U.

Reviewer Registration

REVIEW_REGISTER

In light of your expertise, we have taken the liberty of registering your name in the reviewer database for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. This does not entail any form of commitment on your part, but simply enables us to approach you with a submission to possibly review. On being invited to review, you will have an opportunity to see the title and abstract of the paper in question, and you'll always be in a position to accept or decline the invitation. You can also ask at any point to have your name removed from this reviewer list.

We are providing you with a username and password, which is used in all interactions with the *ESTS* through the website. You may wish, for example, to update your profile, including your reviewing interests.

Username: {$username}

Password: {$password}

Thank you,

{$principalContactSignature}

V.

Password Reset

Your password has been successfully reset for use with the {$siteTitle} web site. Please retain this username and password, as it is necessary for all work with the journal.

Your username: {$username}
Your new password: {$password}

Thank you,

{$principalContactSignature}

V2.

Password Reset Confirmation

PASSWORD_RESET_CONFIRM

We have received a request to reset your password for the {$siteTitle} website.

If you did not make this request, please ignore this email and your password will not be changed. If you wish to reset your password, click on the below URL.

Reset my password: {$url}

Thank you,

{$principalContactSignature}

W.

Archiving Request for {$contextName}

LOCKSS_NEW_ARCHIVE

Dear [University Librarian]:

{$contextName} <{$contextUrl}>, is a journal for which a member of your faculty, [name of member] serves as a [title of position]. The journal is seeking to establish a LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) compliant archive with this and other university libraries.

[Brief description of journal]

X.

Lockss Existing Archive

LOCKSS_EXISTING_ARCHIVE

Dear [University Librarian]:

{$contextName} <{$contextUrl}>, is a journal for which a member of your faculty, [name of member], serves as a [title of position]. The journal is seeking to establish a LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) compliant archive with this and other university libraries.

[Brief description of journal]

Y.

Editor Decision Send to Production

EDITOR_DECISION_SEND_TO_PRODUCTION

Dear {$authorName}:

The editing of your submission, "{$submissionTitle}," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: {$submissionUrl}

{$editorialContactSignature}

Z.

Copyediting Request

Dear {$participantName}:

I would ask that you undertake the copyediting of "{$submissionTitle}" for {$contextName} by following these steps.
1. Click on the Submission URL below.
2. Log into the journal and click on the File that appears in Step 1.
3. Consult Copyediting Instructions posted on webpage.
4. Open the downloaded file and copyedit, while adding Author Queries as needed.
5. Save copyedited file, and upload to Step 1 of Copyediting.
6. Send the COMPLETE email to the editor.

{$contextName} URL: {$contextUrl}
Submission URL: {$submissionUrl}
Username: {$participantUsername}

{$editorialContactSignature}

REMINDERS WE NEED TO KEEP

RA.

Review Request Reminder

REVIEW_REQUEST_REMIND_AUTO

Dear {$reviewerName}:

Just a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for {$contextName}. We were hoping to have your response by {$responseDueDate}, and this email has been automatically generated and sent with the passing of that date.

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript. The submission's abstract is inserted below, and I hope that you will consider undertaking this important task for us.

Please log into the journal web site to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation. The web site is {$contextUrl}

The review itself is due {$reviewDueDate}.

If you do not have your username and password for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* journal's website, you can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username). {$passwordResetUrl}

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for considering this request.

{$editorialContactSignature}

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$submissionAbstract}

RB.

Review Request Invite

Dear {$reviewerName}:

We are writing to inquire whether you would be willing to review the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* (*ESTS*) which was submitted under the [insert genre name] genre to the journal. An abstract for the manuscript is included at the end of this message.

Published by The *Society for Social Studies of Science* (4S), *ESTS* is a vibrant, fully open access journal for cultivating, evaluating, and sharing cutting-edge research in the social studies of science, technology, and medicine in transnational contexts. The current editorial team of *ESTS* is especially committed to: diversifying the geographical base of the journal; strengthening Open Access infrastructure; innovating genre-forms and content; and cultivating sustained attention to pedagogy in STS scholarship. You can read more about our editorial vision on our website.

We rely on reviewers in helping us realize our editorial commitments. Appended below are some questions we would like you to consider while evaluating the submission. Please feel free to respond beyond or outside of these questions as well, if you think a fair review of the manuscript requires that. We are also appending brief descriptions of various genres that *ESTS* publishes, and you can find more information about these on our website.

We believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript and we request that you consider undertaking this important task for us. We realize reviewing a manuscript puts demands on your time, but we hope that you share our view that a critical and constructive assessment of papers is essential in maintaining the quality of the journal and professional standards in the field.

We seek to turn around manuscripts quickly, but responsibly. Our goal is to have reviewers return their assessments within 4 weeks. However, if this timeframe won't work for you, we would be happy to learn what would and to try to work with you. If you are not able to do a review for us, we would appreciate your suggestions of other scholars who would be good for

the job.

Please confirm your willingness to review by logging into our [online system](#) by {$responseDueDate}.

Your review of the submission, along with your recommendation (including a decline to review), should be submitted via our online system by {$reviewDueDate}.

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Editorial Team

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$abstractTermIfEnabled}

{$submissionAbstract}

Reviewer Guidelines

Please consider the following questions in framing your review comments.

- Is the topic sufficiently engaging and important to warrant publication in *ESTS*?
- What are the main contributions of this paper to STS? Please note that contributions can take several forms: conceptual advancement, adding to the empirical record, and methodological and/or pedagogical innovation, for example.
- Is the main argument clearly supported with specific examples and evidence, clearly situated within its context considering an international readership, and grounded in STS

theory and practice? Are possible ways offered for drawing on or extending the analysis in other contexts?

- For **thematic collections**: Does the submission clearly contribute to the thematic collection's overall focus? How can the submission's connections to the thematic collection's overall focus be further strengthened or explicated?
- Is the submission clearly written and properly structured? Are there any parts of the manuscript that should be expanded or condensed? Please note that authors may not be native English speakers: we are asking reviewers to evaluate manuscripts for the clarity of their argument and not for English proficiency. Please direct your comments accordingly.
- Are there exclusions of relevant literature and scholars in this submission? If so, how might these be addressed?
- Have the authors discussed if and how they will share the data used in their manuscript with other researchers or the public (e.g. for further use for research or pedagogical purposes by others)? If so, how? If not, are there opportunities for opening access to their data indicated by the manuscript?
- Does the form of presentation in manuscript align with the content that is being presented? How can the fit between form and content for this submission be strengthened? Do you see opportunities within the manuscript or in the form of supplemental material to engage multi-modal formats?
- Do you see opportunities within the manuscript or as supplemental material that could enhance the pedagogical value of this submission?
- Please provide any other comments that might help us evaluate the manuscript.

Genre Descriptions

Original Research Articles

- Single- or co-authored individual research articles.
- Double-blind peer reviewed by default.
- Here we will consider theoretical papers and empirical studies.
- Target limit: 9k words including notes, excluding references.

Thematic Collections

- ESTS's language for "special issues."
- Can include submissions from across genres.
- Proposals for thematic collections typically pre-reviewed by *ESTS* EC for fit, relevance, and timeliness.

Engagements

- 2k-6k words

- Experiments with the form of presenting STS scholarship.
- Can take multiple forms including, but not limited to: **debates/interactions** (commentaries on essays published in *ESTS*), **review essays** (reviewing themes significant to STS scholars and beyond), **pedagogical interventions/exemplars**, **making and doing multimodal essays**. Please refer to *ESTS* archives for examples of diverse writing in genre forms.
- Can be outward-facing (i.e. undertaking STS analyses on diverse issues) or inward-facing (i.e. reflecting on the field of STS itself).

Perspectives

- Less than 2k words.
- Synthesize STS perspectives on important contemporary issues for a broader audience.
- Reviewed by EC and maybe someone from the Editorial Board.

{$editorialContactSignature}

RC.

Follow-up Invite to our Review Request

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This is a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for {$contextName}. We were hoping to have your response by {$responseDueDate}, and this email has been automatically generated and sent with the passing of that date.

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript. The submission's abstract is inserted below, and I hope that you will consider undertaking this important task for us.

Please log into the journal web site to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation.

The review itself is due {$reviewDueDate}.

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for considering this request.

{$editorialContactSignature}

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$submissionAbstract}

RCA.

Review Request Attached

Follow-up Invite to Review Request (with attachment)

Dear {$reviewerName}:

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript, "{$submissionTitle}," and I am asking that you consider undertaking this important task for us.

The Review Guidelines for this journal are appended below, and the submission is attached to this email. Your review of the submission, along with your recommendation, should be emailed to me by {$reviewDueDate}.

Please indicate in a return email by {$responseDueDate} whether you are able and willing to do the review.

Thank you for considering this request.

{$editorialContactSignature}

Review Guidelines

{$reviewGuidelines}

RD.

Review Request after a Round of Revisions

REVIEW_REQUEST_ONECLICK_SUBSEQUENT

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This regards the manuscript "{$submissionTitle}," which is under consideration by {$contextName}.

Following the review of the previous version of the manuscript, the authors have now submitted a revised version of their paper. We would appreciate it if you could help evaluate it.

Please log into the *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* journal website by {$responseDueDate} to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation.

The review itself is due {$reviewDueDate}.

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Thank you for considering this request.

{$editorialContactSignature}

"{$submissionTitle}"

{$abstractTermIfEnabled}

{$submissionAbstract}

RF.

Submission Review Reminder

REVIEW_REMIND_ONECLICK

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This is a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS){$contextName}*. We were hoping to have this review by {$reviewDueDate}, and would be pleased to receive it as soon as you are able to prepare it.

If you do not have your username and password for accessing *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* website. You can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username). {$passwordResetUrl}

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Please confirm your ability to complete this vital contribution to the work of the journal. WeI look forward to hearing from you.

{$editorialContactSignature}

RG.

Automated Submission Review Reminder

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This is a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS) {$contextName}*. We were hoping to have this review by {$reviewDueDate}, and would be pleased to receive it as soon as you are able to prepare it.

If you do not have your username and password for accessing *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* website. You can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username). {$passwordResetUrl}

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Please confirm your ability to complete this vital contribution to the work of the journal. WeI look forward to hearing from you.

{$editorialContactSignature}

RH.

Automated Submission Review Reminder

REVIEW_REMIND_AUTO_ONECLICK

Dear {$reviewerName}:

This is a gentle reminder of our request for your review of the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," for *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS){$contextName}*. We were hoping to have this review by {$reviewDueDate}, and would be pleased to receive it as soon as you are able to prepare it.

If you do not have your username and password for accessing *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)* website. You can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username). {$passwordResetUrl}

Submission URL: {$submissionReviewUrl}

Please confirm your ability to complete this vital contribution to the work of the journal. WeI look forward to hearing from you.

{$editorialContactSignature}

UV

Validate Your Account

USER_VALIDATE

Dear {$userFullName}:

You have created an account with *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*, but before you can start using it, you need to validate your email account. To do this, simply follow the link below:

{$activateUrl}

Thank you,

{$principalContactSignature}

Unsuitable Submission

Dear Dr {$authorName}:

We write concerning, "{$submissionTitle}", which you submitted to *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (ESTS)*. We have decided not to send your manuscript out for peer-review.

While your paper [VVV], we don't feel that [YYY or ZZZ]. Given your references, we think the manuscript might be better suited to [Journal Title] or a journal focused on [Some Topic].

Thank you for considering *ESTS* for your work. We wish you the very best with its publication.

{$editorialContactSignature}

This category is used when a manuscript does not engage with an STS literature and/or does not advance conceptualization of STS theories or arguments.

This category may also be used if the manuscript is:

-poorly written

-far outside our journal's genre conventions

-not well organized

-has no argument

-is on a topic or issue that is not STS

-or some combination of the above…

[VVV]

--draws together important and interesting empirical material

--advances an innovative conceptual framework

--speaks to subject matter that is critical and timely

[YYY]

--the text/material is sufficiently developed at the point.

--the manuscript sufficiently engages with STS scholarship on these topics.

--the manuscript sufficiently supports the arguments being advanced.

--the manuscript makes a clear contribution to the STS literature.

--the manuscript fits with the scope of the journal.

[ZZZ]

Reasons for immediately rejecting a submission might include:

  The article is outside the scope of the journal

  The article is missing substantial sections (e.g. references)

  The language of the article is very badly written

  The article does not appear interesting enough to consider (perhaps it covers a topic which the journal has already published several articles on, and the editor does not want any more)

There appear to be legal or ethical issues (perhaps there is a possibility of libel within the article, or plagiarism)

{$editorialContactSignature}

EDSR.

Editor Decision Send to Review

Dear {$authorName}:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to {$contextName}, "{$submissionTitle}".

Our decision is to: Send to Review

Submission URL: {$submissionUrl}

{$editorialContactSignature}

ER.

Editor Recommendation

{$editors}:

The recommendation regarding the submission to {$contextName}, "{$submissionTitle}" is: {$recommendation}

{$editorialContactSignature}

tickZZ

New notification from {$siteTitle}

You have a new notification from {$siteTitle}:

{$notificationContents}

Link: {$url}

{$principalContactSignature}

tickZZZ

New notification from {$siteTitle}

You have a new notification from {$siteTitle}:
--
{$notificationContents}

Link: {$url}
--

If you wish to stop receiving notification emails, please go to {$unsubscribeLink}.

{$principalContactSignature}

SDR

Decision on "{$submissionTitle}"

SUBMISSION_DECISION_REVIEWERS

As one of the reviewers for the submission, "{$submissionTitle}," to {$contextName}, I am sending you the reviews and editorial decision sent to the author of this piece. Thank you again for your important contribution to this process.

{$editorialContactSignature}

{$comments}

Backend Templates – Naming Conventions List

All templates in the OJS backend system, ordered by the Review Workflow email dropdown menu

No.	Code	PATH	Name	Changes made
1	✓RB	REVIEW_REQUEST_ONECLICK	Review Request Invite ~~Review Request Oneclick~~	6 Changed title
2	✓ V	PASSWORD_RESET	Password Reset	
3	✓R.	USER_REGISTER	Journal Registration	16
4	✓T.	SUBMISSION_ACK	Author Submission Acknowledgment	12
5	✓UV	USER_VALIDATE	Validate Your Account	17
6	✓ Z	COPYEDIT_REQUEST	Copyediting Request	1a
7	H.	REVIEW_ACK	Article Review Acknowledgement	19a
8	I.	REVIEW_CANCEL	Review Request Canceled	20a
9	K.	REVIEW_CONFIRM	Review Confirm	22a
1	N.	REVIEW_REQUEST	Review Request	3
1	L.	REVIEW_DECLINE	Review Decline	23a
1	✓RD	REVIEW_REQUEST_ONECLICK_SUBSEQUENT	Review Request after a Round of Revisions ~~Review Request Oneclick Subsequent~~	7

1	Q.	REVIEW_REQUEST_SUBSEQUENT	Review Request for a Revised Submission ~~Review Request Subsequent~~	10
1	D.	EDITOR_DECISION_DECLINE	Editor Decision Decline	4a
1	E.	EDITOR_DECISION_RESUBMIT	Editor Decision Resubmit	6a
1	F.	EDITOR_DECISION_REVISIONS	Editor Decision Revisions	7a
1	G.	EDITOR_DECISION_ACCEPT	Editor Decision Accept	3a
1	US.	**new** SUBMISSION_UNSUITABLE	Unsuitable Submission	Asked PKP 15
1	A.	EDITOR_ASSIGN	Editor Assign	2a
2	O.	REVISED_VERSION_NOTIFY	Revised Version Notify	11
2	C.	EDITOR_DECISION_INITIAL_DECLINE	Editor Decision Initial Decline	5a
2	M.	REVIEW_REMIND	Review Remind	24a
2	✓RG	REVIEW_REMIND_AUTO	Automated Submission Review Reminder	25a
2	✓RH	REVIEW_REMIND_AUTO_ONECLICK	Automated Submission Review Reminder	1

2	✓ RA	REVIEW_REQUEST_REMIND_AUTO	Review Request Reminder	8
2	✓ S.	SUBMISSION_ACK_NOT_USER	Author Submission Acknowledgment	13
2	EDSR	EDITOR_DECISION_SEND_TO_EXTERNAL	Editor Decision Send to Review	KEEP for NOW 8a
2	✓ Y	EDITOR_DECISION_SEND_TO_PRODUCTION	Editor Decision Send to Production	9a
2	✓ X	LOCKSS_EXISTING_ARCHIVE	Archiving Request for {$contextName}	12a
3	✓ U.	REVIEWER_REGISTER	Reviewer Registration	18a
3	✓ RF	REVIEW_REMIND_ONECLICK	Submission Review Reminder	2
3	B	PASS_PRE_REVIEWONE	Pass Pre-review	17a
3	J.	REVIEW_COMPLETE_ONE	Review Complete	21a
3	P.	REVISIONS_RECEIVED_ONE	Revisions Received	11
3	ER	EDITOR_RECOMMENDATION	Editor Recommendation	KEEP for NOW 10a

3	✓ W	LOCKSS_NEW_ARCHIVE	Archiving Request for {$contextName}	11a
3	✓ **ZZ**	NOTIFICATION	New notification from {$siteTitle}	Doesn't show up in the reviewer dropdown menu. 13a
3	✓ **ZZZ**	NOTIFICATION_MAILLIST	New notification from {$siteTitle}	Doesn't show up in the reviewer dropdown menu. 14a
3	✓ RC	REVIEW_REQUEST_REMIND_AUTO_ONECLICK	Follow-up Invite to our Review Request ~~Review Request Remind~~ ~~Review Request Remind Auto Oneclick~~	9
4	RCA	REVIEW_REQUEST_ATTACHED	Review Request Attached	4
4	RCA	REVIEW_REQUEST_ATTACHED_SUBSEQUENT	Follow-up Invite to our Review Request (with attachment) ~~Review Request Attached Subsequent~~	??? 5
4	V2	PASSWORD_RESET_CONFIRM	Password Reset Confirmation	16a
4	SDR	**NEW** SUBMISSION_DECISION_REVIEWERS	Decision on "{$submissionTitle}"	Asked PKP when this was added? 14

18 on page 2 of templates.

The numbers on the left are a count of the 43 templates that we have in the OJS system at present.

The ticks refer to the automated templates we need. The numbers in the white boxes and ending with an a, on the right hand column refer to the 1st group of 25 templates in the backend. The numbers in the blue boxes refer to the templates in the second list of templates in the backend on OJS.