



Instructions to Reviewers

Thank you for contributing to *Higher Education in Review* as a reviewer. As you review the manuscript, please keep in mind *HER's* mission to make a substantive contribution to the higher education literature while providing a formative educational experience for our graduate student authors. Comments to the editor (pages 2 and 3 of this form) will remain confidential. The feedback you provide for the author on page 4 will be stripped of your identifying information and shared with the author.

As you shape your critique, we recommend the following:¹

- Authors will receive an anonymous copy of your comments. Always be polite, scholarly, detailed, and constructive. Use a professional style in preparing your comments. Avoid disparaging interjections, personal attacks, and offensive exclamations. Do not use your review as an opportunity to promote your own work unless it is clearly and directly relevant to the manuscript under review.
- Always talk about the paper, not the author. Scrutinize the issues and ideas, and not the author. Your review should reflect your scholarly judgment and competence.
- Be consistent; don't write a very promising set of comments to the author, and then say very negative things about the manuscript to the editor (or vice versa).
- When you make recommendations to an author, provide enough detail for the author to understand why you make the recommendation. (Don't say "You should discuss Weber's work." Do say "You should discuss Weber's theory of the relationship between capitalism and Protestantism, because the social dynamics described in that theory are very similar to the social dynamics you are discussing.")
- Even if you think a manuscript is seriously flawed, try to give the author suggestions as to how it might be improved. Also be sure to identify the strengths of a paper, and consider whether and how those strengths might be salvaged.
- Authors whose first language is not English: Sometimes you will receive a manuscript which obviously is written by someone whose first language is not English. In these cases, please be sure to distinguish, as best you can, between the quality of writing and quality of ideas. Writing problems in an otherwise insightful paper, for example, could be fixed in revision, or by partnering with a coauthor whose first language is English.

Please consider the manuscript type while composing your critique. Suggestions noted below are not exhaustive but intended only to serve as a starting point for your review.

If the paper is a:

- research paper, consider the research design, sampling, and data collection procedures; the analysis and interpretation of data; the presentation of results in coherent tables and figures; the appropriateness of the conclusions; and the practical implications of the results.
- policy paper, consider the policy perspective, presentation of policy alternatives and implications.
- professional practice paper, consider the problem definition, the context, the presentation of suitable alternatives and the practical implications for other practitioners.
- literature review, consider its scope, freedom from bias, and integration of material, and whether it brings a new perspective to the literature.

¹ Recommendations from *Business Ethics Quarterly* at <http://www.buec.udel.edu/beq/reviewers.htm>



Comments to the Editor

Reviewer:

Date assigned:

Manuscript number:

Due date:

Manuscript title:

- Overall recommendation. Please weigh the significance of the problem, the rigor of the scholarship, and the clarity of the writing.

_____ Accept (after minor revisions or copy editing)

_____ Revise and reconsider (important article, strongly encourage author to revise)

_____ Revise and reconsider (entertain revision, but not likely to become an essential article)

_____ Reject (do not encourage revision for reasons indicated)

- Please evaluate the paper using the scale: (4) Excellent, (3) Good, (2) Fair, (1) Poor, (NA) Not Applicable

_____ Originality of work

_____ Suitability of the analytical approach

_____ Importance of the problem

_____ Clarity and presentation of analysis

_____ Quality/completeness of lit review

_____ Adequacy of conclusions/implications

_____ Conceptual framework

_____ Quality of writing

_____ Research design

_____ Organization of ideas

_____ Quality of data

- Comments to the Editors: Please provide your comments to Editors on page 3 of this form. These comments will not be shared with the author(s).
- Feedback for the Author(s): Please provide the author with a formative critique of their manuscript on page 4 of this form. Return the manuscript only if you wish the author to use your marginal annotations when revising.

Please submit your completed review form via email to HigherEducationInReview@psu.edu. If you wish to provide in-text editorial suggestions, please do so using Microsoft Word's track changes option or other suitable electronic format.



Comments to the Editors

Reviewer:

Manuscript title:

Comments to the Editors:



Feedback for the Author(s)

Reviewer:

Manuscript title:

Advice for the Author(s):