

***JoDE* Peer Reviewer Guidelines**

Thank you for sharing your expertise with our authors as a Peer Reviewer. The peer review process is a valuable way to mentor and encourage authors and to shape dance education research. We thank you in advance for your work as a Peer Reviewer!

JoDE uses a double anonymous review process, meaning neither the author's nor the reviewers' identities are known to the other. All comments and feedback from your review are compiled and sent directly to the author(s), regardless of the recommendation outcome. Peer reviews are not only a way to determine the scope and content of *JoDE*, but they also provide feedback to authors, and therefore help mentor authors and encourage emerging dance education research. Please keep this in mind when providing feedback and writing your review.

When completing your review, you will be asked to both make a recommendation about publication and to offer feedback on the submission. What follows are a brief description of what the different "recommendations" mean and some suggestions about what your peer review could include.

Description of Peer Reviewer Recommendations:

- *Accept for publication as submitted*
 - This is usually a nearly 'perfect' or perfect manuscript that is so strong that it can immediately go to copyediting. It is very rare to receive a rating of *Accept as Submitted* the first time around, since even an excellent manuscript often has minor errors.
- *Accept with minor revisions*
 - These manuscripts should be easily 'fixed' with straightforward, detailed corrections and changes. The revisions offered should be able to be addressed in a short amount of time (about two to four weeks).
- *Revise and resubmit*
 - These manuscripts have great potential but need a good deal of revisions to ready for publication. *Revise & resubmit* carries no obligation for future publication. The manuscript is back in the author's court. The author can decide to resubmit or not.
- *Unacceptable for publication; rejection recommended*
 - These manuscripts do receive Peer Reviewers' comments in the hope that comments and recommendations will assist the author in the future. Please keep this in mind as you write your comments.

Writing a Peer Review (*Note: These are suggestions but not requirements for structuring your peer review.*)

- At the start of your review, it is helpful to situate your own positionality and expertise (without revealing your identity). Sharing this makes the context of your feedback more visible, allowing an author to make informed choices as they revise their submission.
- A good format is to begin with your OVERALL summary and assessment of the manuscript.
 - Begin with one or two sentences that summarize your understanding of the main argument of the article. This allows the author to understand whether or not their intended message came across.
 - It is often helpful to say something positive about the content and/or the writing towards the top of your review. This reinforces the idea that the review process is constructive and that reviewers' feedback is offered so that authors can build upon the strengths of the manuscript as they revise.
- Then move to GENERAL COMMENTS about the manuscript. Comments in this portion of the review may address content, methods, logic, and rhetoric.

- **Content:** This is about the ideas. Are the concepts in the manuscript sound, well-articulated, and appropriate for the field? Might the author need to better explain particular concepts or read additional material so that their understanding is better rooted in disciplinary discourse?
- **Methods:** This will depend on if the article is In Practice, Research, or Feature article, but is generally about the work (or process) that went into developing the content. Were the methods sound? Is the practice rigorous? Is the analysis believable?
- **Logic:** This is about the actual argument in the manuscript. Are the ideas logically connected and developed? Is your statement summarizing the author's argument supported by the rest of the writing?
- **Rhetoric:** This is about writing style. Thinking about the broad readership of *JoDE*, does the writing speak to *JoDE*'s readership? Is it too technical or not technical enough, for example? Are there recurring grammar, punctuation, syntax, or structural errors that need attention?
- Then move to **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** about the manuscript with strong examples, specific page numbers, and concrete suggestions for improvement. Specific comments often focus on the sentence level (e.g., corrections to grammar or punctuation, questions about word choice, formatting, etc.). Not all reviews need to offer specific comments.
- *JoDE* believes deeply that the review process is an opportunity for mentorship, so even critical reviews should suggest a path forward for the authors. Remember that as a Peer Reviewer, you are reviewing the manuscript, not the author. We ask that you use language that addresses the manuscript itself and not the perceived attributes or deficiencies of the author. In this spirit, we have also found that offering words of encouragement at the end of the review, regardless of your decision about the manuscript, contributes to a more constructive review process for authors.

Submitting your Review

When you open the reviewing page on Scholar One, you will notice that there are two different boxes for comments. The first is for confidential comments to the editor which will not be seen by the author. This is a place to express any concerns or questions you have that you would prefer not to share with the author but feel the editor needs to know prior to making a publication decision.

The second box, comments for the author, holds comments that will go directly to authors to help them improve their writing and is where you should type (or “cut and paste”) your review.

If any questions arise at any time, please contact *JoDE*'s Editor-in-Chief, Karen Schupp at karen.schupp@asu.edu.