Ratio

An international journal of analytic philosophy

Information for authors of articles accepted for *Ratio*

1. *Ratio* appears four times a year: in March, June and September (regular issues), plus a Special Issue (of invited papers on a specific theme) in December. Your paper will appear online in Early View before the final online issue and corresponding hard copy version. The Editor does not normally consider unsolicited proposals for the Special Issue, but there may be exceptions. Please contact the Editor if you think your proposal might be appropriate.

   After your paper is accepted, you will be contacted by Wiley about submitting a **Licence to Publish form**, which must be submitted before processing of your paper can proceed. This replaces the previous copyright transfer agreement.

   Please be aware that **space in the journal is extremely tight**, and any alterations you now make to your paper should not increase the overall length without specific approval from the editor. As indicated in our Author Guidelines (also available under 'Instructions and Forms' on the ScholarOne website), **articles for normal issues of *Ratio* should usually not exceed 6000 words *including* all notes and references. For the Special Issue, the word limit including notes and references is usually 8000 words.**

   A short **abstract** (maximum 200 words) is given at the head of each article published in *Ratio.* This does not apply to critical notices and reviews (see below). If you have for any reason not uploaded an abstract to the ScholarOne website you must do so as soon as possible. Remember that many of your readers will now consult the journal online, and that is in your own interest to write your abstract in a way that will attract attention from electronic search engines; please consult the publisher's advice here.

   Please note that **typographical corrections only** are allowed at proof stage; production costs make other corrections prohibitively expensive. If, therefore, you have any substantive changes to make to your article, however small, these should be made before you upload your final version for proof-setting (subject to item 3 above). **Once the material has been prepared for Early View publication**

(followed in due course by the final online and print version), it will be too late to make any further alterations.

Proofs will be made available to authors as a **pdf file** by email from the proof-setter shortly after the final version of your document has been uploaded. **Failure to adhere rigorously to the style guidelines will significantly delay online publication.** *Please ensure the contact information in your Ratio ScholarOne account is up to date.* Authors must return their corrected proof electronically within the deadline in the email sent with the proof, unless an extension is agreed with the production team.

The publishers will send contributors a **final pdf file** of their article on publication, and details of this arrangement will be provided by Wiley at proof stage.

2. You may wish to know about whether and what version of your paper you may upload to your personal website or university repository. Please see here for Wiley's policy on self-archival, where all your questions will be answered.

Experience has shown that it saves a great deal of time, and minimises the possibility of errors, if authors observe the following **style guidelines** when submitting their final version. If your typescript is not already in the form indicated below, you are asked to produce a revised version adhering strictly and absolutely to all of the rules applicable to your paper.

Ratio style guidelines

General

1. On separate line spaces, provide: first the **Article Type** (e.g. Original Article, Special Issue, Critical Notice, Review); then **Title** in sentence case, bold; then **Author's Name** in Title Case; then **Affiliation Address**. Provide the **Correspondence** address and email address in one block. Then the word '**Abstract'** set to bold Times New Roman, sentence case, followed on next line by the text of the abstract, block text indented.

See below example:

Original Article

Vague Comparisons

Cristian Constantinescu

Department of Philosophy, Birkbeck University of London, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX, UK

Correspondence

Cristian Constantinescu, Department of Philosophy, Birkbeck University of London, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX, UK.

Email: c.constantinescu@bbk.ac.uk

Abstract

Here is the abstract of my brilliant article. Look at how I have block indented it over to the right of the page, with right hand justification. This is part of the wonderful new design for *Ratio* articles. I hope you like it and that everyone reads my new article!

2. Please list 5-6 keywords beneath your abstract in alphabetical order. Listing your keywords will help researchers find your work in databases.

3. Funding Information (if applicable) following keywords, e.g:

Funding information

Research for this article was funded by the Global Foundation for Philosophical Funding and the Association for the Advancement of Philosophy, grant nos. 12345678 and 87654321.

4. Use **single line spacing**, including for abstract and footnotes. (This saves paper, and now that setting is done electronically there is no need for the wider spacing that used to be needed for the copy-editor to add pencil annotations.) Times New Roman font recommended: 12pt for text and references, 10 or 11pt for footnotes.

First level headings must be all CAPITAL LETTERS and the subheading level must be Sentence case. Then the first line of the opening paragraph of a section should be flush left, subsequent paragraphs indented (**without** line space before new paragraph). **Please be sparing with extra line spaces: space costs money**. Leave **just one** line space before a new section heading, then start new section on next line after section heading **without a further line space.**

British spelling (e.g. colo<u>u</u>r; s<u>c</u>epticism).

Use *italic* **not** <u>underline</u> for emphasised words and phrases.

Ragged RH margin (please do **not** use justified RH margins).

'Seventeenth century', not '17th century'. Hyphen when used adjectivally, but not when used substantivally, thus: 'In the seventeenth century it was common . . .' (no hyphen); but 'Most seventeenth-century philosophers . . .' (hyphen).

Avoid colloquialisms, slang, and pejoratives ('we need to do some heavy lifting to make this theory work', 'I'd be gobsmacked if this idea had legs', 'this concept is rubbish', etc; extreme examples, but the rule is clear enough).

No contractions (can't, don't, won't, shouldn't, etc.)

If your word-processing program allows (most do) please use 'n dash' (–) when you want a dash in the text. Do not use the shorter hyphen character (-) when a full dash is required.

Please do **not** refer to theses or propositions by *tiresome and irritating acronyms* ('hereafter TAIA'). These may be convenient for authors who know what they mean, but are invariably irksome for the reader, who will forget their significance after a

page or two. Use a short memorable label ('hereafter the Avoid Acronyms Rule') instead, and continue to refer to the thesis or proposition by that short label.

Quotations

1. Use 'single' quotation marks for ordinary quotations, thus: Descartes wrote, 'From time to time the senses deceive us.' Use "double" quotation marks only if a quotation appears within a quotation, thus: Descartes wrote, 'I decided to accept this truth "I am thinking, therefore I exist" as the first principle of my philosophy.'

2. Where a quotation lasts three or more lines, it should be typed as an extract, without quotation marks, whole block indented, right-hand ragged, with a single line space before and after the extract.

References and Notes

1. Your reference list, or bibliography, should appear at the end of your paper on a new page separate from the text, alphabetised by the last name of the first author of each work; label this page 'References' centred at the top of the page. The references list provides the information necessary for a reader to locate and retrieve any source you cite in the body of the paper. Each source you cite in the paper must appear in your reference list; likewise, each entry in the reference list must be cited in your text at least once. **Please avoid overly long reference lists, just as you should avoid an abundance of footnotes.**

2. In-text citations should be made in one of the following formats:

Bloggs (2013) argued… **or**

It was argued (Bloggs, 2013, pp. 50–60)

and for multiple authors and/or multiple references:

(Bloggs & Bloom, 2013) *[NB must be ampersand, not 'and']*

(Bloom, 2013a, 2013b)

(Bloggs, Bloom, Black, Biggs, & O'Connell, 2013; Roosevelt & Franklin, 2010)

Please avoid absurdities like 'Leibniz (1969), p.644'. Use instead 'Leibniz, in Loemker, ed. (1969), p.644'. Even better, supply original date of publication in square brackets, thus: 'Leibniz, *Monadology* [1714] in Loemker, ed. (1969), p.644'; or even Leibniz (1969/1714), with the bibliography showing:

Leibniz (1969/1714) *Monadology*, in Loemker, L.W. (ed.). *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Philosophical Papers and Letters*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

3. Footnotes should **not** be used to give bibliographic information: that all belongs in the reference list (bibliography). Footnotes – used sparingly at all times – should be

only used for further discussion following on from the main text and/or for author-date citations (instead of putting author-date in the main text), but in either case **all the bibliographic information goes in the reference list**. When providing footnotes as supplemental information, be brief and focus on only one subject. Try to limit your comments to one small paragraph. **Do not use endnotes.**

4. For your general citation method, please do not mix and match **in-text** author-date citations and **footnote** author-date citations. **Either** use in-text author-date citations plus bibliography; **or** author names in-text plus *all* citations in footnotes, in author-date format. **In either case a reference list (bibliography) is essential**.

5. References to articles should be made thus:

   [3] Beers, S. R.,& De Bellis, M. D. (2002). Neuropsychological function in children with maltreatment-related post-traumatic stress disorder. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *159*, 483–486. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.159.3.483

   NB you do not need to hyperlink the doi; full page numbers are required, so '483-6' is unacceptable; journal titles and volume numbers should be in italics.

6. References to books should be made thus:

   Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
   or
   Duncan, G. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

   NB book titles should be in italics.

7. In main text, put a superscript footnote marker *after* punctuation, thus: as has been argued elsewhere.[2] (NOT: elsewhere[2].)

8. Acknowledgments and thanks, if any, should be placed at the end of the last sentence of the article, not in a footnote. Use the title **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS** in all capitals, bold, with the acknowledgements text following straight underneath.

   Discussions and reviews

   Ratio rarely publishes discussion pieces, but if we do it will be a maximum of 3000 words. Each issue of the journal contains a maximum of one book review, usually 2000-2500 words maximum, or a bit longer for critical notices. An abstract is **not** required for a discussion or a review, but affiliation must still appear (see below).

Please use the following formats (including the word 'DISCUSSION' or 'REVIEW', centred, caps, at the top of your typescript):

DISCUSSION

ON BLOGGS ON BRAINS IN VATS

Gary Genius

The idea that we might all be brains in vats seems outlandish to say the least. Brian Bloggs (2028), however, has in a recent article provided a novel argument that to all but the subtlest of intellects seems to prove conclusively that we are indeed, after all, in the end, plain old brains in vats. I will argue that despite Bloggs' ingenuity, his new defence of this sceptical hypothesis fails before it even gets started.

REFERENCES

Bloggs, B. (2028). Are we brains in vats? You'd better believe it! *Ratio*, 73, 117–138.

University of Excellence,

Great Ideas, UK.

genius@excellence.ac.uk

REVIEW

Book Review: Knockdown Arguments: A Primer [NB Upright text for title]

Kevin Knockdown

Himalayan University Press, Tibet, 2037, £88.95, xiii+731 pp. [NB place of publication *after* publisher]

How does one knock down an unknockdownable argument? Kevin Knockdown offers an answer in his provocative new book. Developing work begun in the 1960s and not yet concluded, Knockdown takes us on a tour of the terrain of knockdown arguments, the centrepiece being his infamous 'knockdown argument with no premises'. This is a book the whole family will love.

Ian Incredulous

Timbuktu State University

Timbuktu 61001, Africa.

incredulous@timbuktu.org

Footnotes should be kept to a minimum in discussions and avoided altogether in reviews.

If you have any comments on this style sheet, or on any aspect of *Ratio*, please contact the Editor: ratio@reading.ac.uk.