

IJPS Peer Review Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript being considered for publication in the *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*.

The review process:

- **Anonymity** - Submissions undergo a double-blinded peer review process; both reviewer's and author's identities are concealed.
- **Confidentiality** - All manuscripts are privileged communication. Please do not show or discuss manuscripts with anyone, except to solicit assistance with a technical point. If you feel a colleague is more qualified to be a reviewer of the manuscript than you are, please request permission from the managing editor to make the change. The review and your recommendations remain confidential.

Conflicts of interest - If the author's identity inadvertently becomes known to you, please notify the managing editor immediately before continuing the review.

Guiding questions for reviewers:

What is the paper's major contribution? What are its strengths and weaknesses and its overall suitability for publication? Please delineate the most significant points the author(s) makes.

- Is the paper of importance and interest to this journal's readers?
- Does it exhibit academic soundness and connection to Partnership Studies/Cultural Transformation Theory with logical arguments?
- Is it original?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data?
- Is the prose clear, concise without redundancies, and grammatically correct?
- Are all citations (in-text and reference list) in correct APA6 format?

Note: First reviewers have an option to refuse the piece if there is no connection to partnership studies.

Specific components to focus on:

- **Presentation** - Does the paper tell a cohesive story? Is it tightly reasoned throughout? Identify any sections that are vague or unclear. Do the title, abstract, keywords, description, and introduction accurately and consistently reflect the paper's content and intent? Is the writing clear, concise, easy to follow, and interesting?
- **Length** - Are there sections of the paper that should be expanded, condensed, or eliminated? Does it meet the length guidelines of a 20-page limit (plus references)?
- **Methods** - Are they appropriate, current, and described well enough that others could replicate the research?
- **Data presentation** - Does the prose support the data presented in tables and graphs? Is the material presented in a way that makes it easily comprehensible and clearly labeled? Does the author provide enough detail, too much, or too little? Are all the references to the data clear and unambiguous?
- **Statistical design and analyses** - Are they appropriate and correct? Can readers easily identify which measurements or observations are independent of which other measurements or observations? Are replicates clearly and correctly identified? Are significance statements justified?
- **Errors** - Are there any errors in technique, fact, calculation, or interpretation?
- **Citations** - Are all pertinent references cited? Are they provided for all assertions not supported by the data reported in this paper?
- **Overlap** - Does this paper report data or conclusions already published elsewhere?
- **Discussion and speculation** - Does the paper clearly distinguish between discussion and speculation? Is all speculation clearly identified as such?

We recommend labeling the sections as such, to ensure that speculation is clearly designated.

Fairness and objectivity:

Reviewers should frame their critique in terms of the research, not the researcher. In both tone and content, the reviewer should express respect for the author and his or her professional efforts.

Reviewers are responsible for assuring the author that:

- the entire paper was read carefully;
- criticisms are accurate and objective, not merely differences of opinion;
- any critique is intended to help the author improve the paper; and
- the reviewer is qualified to pass professional judgment on the research and its presentation.