sevenbridges

PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES

Thank you for offering to review an article submitted for publication in our journal. Peer review is a fundamental component of academic publishing. The review process is blind, meaning that neither you nor the author will know the identity of the other.

The purpose of peer review is to ensure that published articles are of an appropriate academic standard. It is our policy for each article to be considered by at least two reviewers. The Editor retains the authority to decide whether to publish an article on the basis of the reviewers' reports and their own judgement (see *Editorial Workflow* below).

Please provide as much detail as possible in your responses. Your report will be available only to the Editor. All comments should be of a strictly professional nature. You should respond to the following areas of focus as part of your review report (see *Peer Review Guidelines* and *Peer Review Report* below):

1. Style:

This requires you to check that the current form of the article is in accordance with the agreed standards of the journal in terms of structure, referencing, and bibliography. Stylistic or grammatical problems should be highlighted, but it is not necessary to make recommended changes (see *Style Guide* below).

2. Content:

You are not required to agree with the conclusions of the article, but rather with the structure of the argument. You may therefore disagree with the findings of the research, as long as the manner in which they have been reached is sound. The argument should flow logically based on the evidence given throughout the article. The conclusions should fit the rest of the article without making unfounded or spurious claims. The research methodology used should be valid and appropriate.

3. Supporting evidence:

The article should contain adequate references to current scholarship on the topic being investigated. Whilst the bibliography may contain classic works on the subject, it is expected that it will also contain recent texts (where appropriate). Empirical evidence should be clearly outlined. Sources used should be appropriate to the content and method of the article. Rationalisations and support for methodology should also be appropriate.

4. Recommendations

You should highlight any particular actions which the author or Editor should undertake in preparing the text for publication. Comments should be constructive, even if the article should not be considered further for publication.

Please return your report (see appendix B) to the Editor by the agreed deadline. Please contact the Editor promptly if you are unable to complete the review, so that it can be reassigned.

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name	
Email	
Date	
Title of article	

Style	
- Does the article conform to the journal style guides? - Does it have an appropriate title? - Is the abstract a clear representation of the article?	
Content	
- Does the article make a clear, logical and sustained argument? - Are there any errors in content? - Does the article promote further discussion (relating to theory, method, or research data)?	

Supporting evidence	
- Does the article make reference to appropriate supporting evidence? - Does it use appropriate data and methods? - Does it make appropriate use of secondary literature? - Are the sources suitable to academic writing? - Are the references in the correct format?	4

Ethical issues

Recommendations

Recommended for publication?	
Yes	
No	

Examples of Peer Review Comments

'Could refer to even more up-to-date works regarding self-motivated, 'meta' learning, e.g. Griffith and Burns' (2012) "Outstanding Teaching: Engaging Learners" (Crown House Publishing).'

'Although the article makes some interesting points it is bulked up with irrelevant educational theory, then doesn't actually present any results. It reads like the author has cut and paste bits from a longer academic thesis without reworking it to improve the flow.'

'It is logically arranged, section by section and a clear, sustained argument is largely advanced.'

'Results: At present, despite discussing results in the conclusion there are no results presented at all, this must be rectified.'

'References especially websites are not always in the correct format'

'Published literature in this area is well cited to support throughout. Appropriate acknowledgement of lack of literature published as to Learning to Learn and 'Meta' learning within the secure environment.'

'They need to choose one theme and stick to it.'

Editorial Workflow

Initial enquiry
- Send out Welcome Pack
- Send digital copy of previous issue

Submission
- Article distributed to Editors
- Inform contributor of editorial and peer review process.

Peer review process
- Anonymise article and forward to two peer reviewers
- Peer reviewers complete *Peer Review Report*. Return to Editorial Team within two week deadline.

Initial review - Editorial Team
- Article suitable for publication - passed straight to peer review
- Article suitable for publication with amendments - feedback with comments, corrections to be made before peer review
- Article unsuitable for publication - article does not meet expected requirements for publication, feedback with comments

Return amendments to contributor
- Editors collate comments from peer review report, plus additional feedback, into *Editorial Feedback Form.*
- Return feedback to contributor. Either: 1) accepted no changes, 2) accepted with changes, 3) rejected.

Final editorial checks on amended article
- Check amendments against feedback
- Place article into template for publication
- Return final copy to contributor

Publish