

## **PEER REVIEWER CHECKLIST**

**Manuscript Title: In The Midst of The Storm**

**Author: Latrese N. Carter**

**Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_**

## Writing the Review

The Peer Reviewer's goal is to improve the manuscript. It should be concise, clear and relevant. The reviewer should identify possible areas of confusion and make specific suggestions. The manuscript should be considered confidential; and all information from it should not be shared for any reason. As a reviewer, you will examine the manuscript to provide the author with clear feedback.

## General Guidelines for Providing Feedback to the Author

- A. Provide the author with constructive suggestions addressing how the manuscript may be strengthened or revised.
- B. Support general comments with specific evidence and substantiate all statements.
- C. Be thorough and constructive. Remember, the manuscript reflect countless hours of work on the part of the author.
- D. Direct all criticism on paper, not to the author.
- E. Avoid personal comments about the author or biases about the subject matter.

## Structure of the Review:

- A. Answer series of guided questions.
- B. State decision. Make a recommendation regarding the status of the manuscript.
  1. Accept- Publish this manuscript in its present form.
  2. Accept with revisions- This indicates that the manuscript will be accepted for publication provided the recommended revisions are made. State whether the revisions are minor or major in scope. Revisions should not significantly change the content of the book. Manuscripts in this category normally require: minor revisions, appropriate analysis (or minor easily correctable flaws), no major flaws in concept, reorganization of content to improve readability, expansion of citations.
  3. Reconsider after revisions- The material may be worthy of publication in the journal following substantial revision. The needed revisions are extensive enough to warrant resubmission as a new paper.
  4. Reject- The material is not suitable for publication due to: serious flaws, incorrect or inadequate information, and lack of originality.
- C. Provide a rationale for your decision/ feedback for the authors. Your rationale and feedback should outline your main reasons for making the recommendation and be substantiated by specific evidence to support your comments.

## Length of Review

Comments received back from peer reviewers can be brief (1–2 paragraphs) or lengthy (up to 3 pages). Reviews usually identify a range of strengths and weaknesses found in the manuscript, and the reviewers provide various ratings on publishability and acceptability.

## I. Guiding Questions for Reviewers

Using the following rating scheme, provide your feedback regarding the statements listed.

**Poor**                  **Fair**                  **Good**                  **Very Good**                  **Excellent**  
1                                  2                                  3                                  4                                  5

| <b>Statement</b>                                 | <b>Rating</b> |
|--|---------------|
| Title  |               |
| Organization                                     |               |
| Relevance  |               |
| Originality                                      |               |
| Clarity of writing                               |               |
| Pacing   |               |
| Tone   |               |
| Sentence structure                               |               |
| Grammar and syntax                               |               |
| Precise and effective wording                    |               |
| Logical development of ideas                     |               |
| Development of the characters                    |               |
| How well does the manuscript meets its given aim |               |
| Conclusion                                       |               |

***Please provide a brief explanation of your ratings:***



- G. Are topics or things missing that should be covered? Explain why you think so. Give examples.
  
- H. Does it present a new and significant contribution to the literature?
  
- I. Is it significant to a target community or audience? If so, which one(s).
  
- J. Does the author present contrary perspectives?
  
- K. Did the conclusion meet your expectations? Why or Why not?
  
- L. Do you have suggestions for a new title?

### **III. Suggestions for the author**

This is your opportunity to provide constructive feedback on a chapter, specific paragraph or encounter contained in the book that you believe is in need of rework. Please be concise, clear and courteous with your suggestion.

### **IV. Additional comments to the author**

### **V. Final Recommendation**

**Reviewer Recommendation: (mark only one)**

**Accept**

**Accept w/ Revisions**

**Reconsider after revisions**

**Rejection**

**Additional Comments**

A large, empty rectangular box with a black border, intended for providing additional comments. The box occupies most of the page below the header.