Guidelines for Academic Journal Reviewers

EVALUATION QUESTIONS (JSLW)

In reviewing the enclosed manuscript, please write a prose evaluation--the questions provided below are meant to be suggestive rather than directive; so feel free to organize your comments as you see fit.

I. Does the manuscript address an important problem or issue in second language writing?

II. Is the manuscript grounded in appropriate theory?

III. Is the relevant existing literature acknowledged?

IV.
   A. For manuscripts which discuss issues in essay form:
      1. Is the author's presentation clear, sound, and logical?
      2. Are the author's claims well supported?
      3. Are the author's conclusions reasonable?
   
   B. For manuscripts which report on empirical research:
      1. Are the context, subjects, data collection, and data analysis adequately described?
      2. Is the study valid, reliable, and replicable?
      3. Are the results presented in a fair and balanced manner?
      4. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the study's findings?

V. Is the manuscript well-written?

VI. Overall, does the manuscript represent a significant advance in knowledge on second language writing?
Letter from the Editor (CCC)

Dear Professor You:

Thanks for reviewing the attached manuscript submitted to CCC. Your work as a consulting reader helps make CCC the leading journal in composition studies. As you are aware, your timely response is important both for author morale and general workflow.

Although you may choose to write your evaluation in the form of a letter to the author, you can choose to do otherwise. Please indicate whether you recommend publication or rejection. You may also recommend that the author revise and resubmit the article. In this letter, could you please delineate the following:

1. Why this article is or is not appropriate for publication in CCC. Consider issues that include these: Does the article contribute something new and innovative to the body of research and scholarship in the field? Has the author done his or her "homework" and laid the groundwork for these new, publishable ideas? Is the style appropriate for the field and the profession?

2. Any advice you may have about further work the author might want or need to do on the project if you're recommending that she or he revise and resubmit. This advice might concern additional research—other texts the author might want to read, specific suggestions for revision, and so on.

You may sometimes feel that you can recommend publishing a piece only if the author makes certain specific revisions to it, and if this is the case, then you should say so.

As a rule of thumb, though, I would prefer that you not recommend that the author revise and resubmit the piece—that is, please do not ask a writer to do significant new work on a manuscript unless you believe that its chances of being published are strong. (It may help to keep in mind here that there is space to print fewer than one in ten submissions to CCC.)

In most cases, your response need not run more than a single typed page or two at the very most. Finally, as a gesture towards keeping the exchange of ideas in our field as collegial as possible, I encourage you to sign your comments, though you are not required to do so.

You do not need to return the manuscript. Simply put its title and number at the top of your comments, and mail this to me by the above date - or send them to me via email at XXX@###.edu. Don't hesitate to call me at 1-###-####-#### if you have any questions or run into any delays. You can also reach ### ###, my editorial assistant, at 1-###-####-####.

Thank you again for your support of CCC. Your work is significant in maintaining a collaborative, accountable editorial process.

Sincerely,

### ###,