Peer Review Guidelines

Your final review will consist of three parts:

1) Your detailed comments to the author (see detailed instructions below). Please be careful to omit any references to yourself. If the editor(s) accept the review, the author(s) will see the review exactly as you submit it. Comments to the author should be submitted in the spaces provided.

2) Your recommended decision (check one of the three options):
   - Encourage major revisions as described in my report.
   - Accept this article with minor (or no) revisions as described in my report.
   - Reject this article without an option to resubmit.

3) A note to the Editors in which you will include comments that the author will not see. Please explain the nuances of your recommended decision. The cover letter should be submitted in the space provided.

Please structure your comments to address the issues listed below, and please provide concrete and constructive details on how you think the manuscript could be improved if revised.

1) Argument of the Manuscript:
   - Does the manuscript present a sound, well-structured argument?
   - Are its claims and findings convincing and well-supported?
   - Does the paper advance or spark discussion?
   - Is the topic original and does it have the potential to stimulate future research?
   - Are the appropriate authors in the field(s) cited or referenced?
   - What are the strengths and limitations of the overall argument?

2) Appropriateness for InterActions:
   - Is the manuscript topic developed in a way that is relevant and significant to the field(s)?
   - Will it interest a broad audience of readers from multiple disciplines?
   - Does it fit within the scope of the journal?
   - (http://escholarship.org/uc/search?entity=gseis_interactions;view=mission)

3) Methodology:
   - Is the methodology identified and explained?
   - Is the methodology competent and appropriate to the question(s) being asked?
   - What are the methodology’s strengths and limitations?
   - For non-empirical manuscripts, is the conceptual approach to the material addressed and justified? Is the analysis clear, and does the piece satisfy its own conceptual criteria?
4) Style:
   • Is the bibliography adequate (timely and comprehensive)?
   • Is the writing clear and polished? Please identify specific areas of text that are problematic.
   • Will InterActions’ interdisciplinary audience be able to follow the structure and language of the piece? Does it keep jargon to a minimum?
   • Is the manuscript too long or too short?
   • Does the manuscript follow APA guidelines?

5) Miscellaneous comments/recommendations for the author.