



## Instructions for peer reviewing

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your interest in reviewing prospective CJSP articles for Volume 1 to be published in Spring 2020. The papers you are about to review have undergone an initial pre-selection process by a CJSP Editor to determine their compliance with CJSP submission requirements.

As a peer-reviewer, we invite you to comment on the paper and provide feedback to the author in terms of how the material can be further improved. Please be constructive with your feedback and evaluate the relevance of the paper. Some general questions you may wish to ask yourself whilst reading a paper are: *How can this article be improved? What are its strengths? What are its weaknesses?* (See the guidelines below for further suggestions). Please also be mindful when providing your feedback. Whilst the purpose is to provide suggestions for improvement and critical feedback, it is important to deliver comments in a respectful manner. Comments should not single out individuals or be degrading, derogatory, demeaning, or discriminatory in any form. Don't forget that pointing out good things about a paper is also helpful and encouraging for the author.

Please familiarise yourself with the guidelines below before peer-reviewing. Thank you once more and we wish you an enjoyable peer-reviewing experience!

### ***Guidelines for reviewing a CJSP article***

Given the broad and interdisciplinary readership of CJSP, we aim to provide authors with feedback from a variety of perspectives during the review process. As such, we normally choose one specialist reviewer and one non-specialist reviewer per prospective article. The guidelines below distinguish between specialist and non-specialist reviewers.

Please consider the following before agreeing to review the article:

- Do you have time to complete a thorough review of the paper? We expect reviewers to return their comments within a three-week period. To prevent hold-ups during the review process, please feel free to suggest an alternative reviewer if you do not think this will be possible..



- Do you have any conflict-of-interest (i.e., working relationship with the author on the project at hand, competing financial incentives, etc.)? If so, please declare these to the CJSP editor before reviewing.

### *Guidelines for Specialist Reviewers*

Specialist reviewers will meet one or more of the following criteria:

- They have sufficient knowledge of the topic of the contribution;
- They have indicated interest in the broader field of the contribution in their peer-reviewer capture form;
- Their existing knowledge is deemed transferable to the topic of the contribution.

If you are concerned you are not qualified to be a specialist reviewer, please raise the issue with the editor. It may be that you have been chosen to provide a particular perspective on the paper. Please feel free to suggest an alternative reviewer if appropriate.

In addition to addressing general questions mentioned in the instructions (i.e., *How can this article be improved? What are its strengths? What are its weaknesses?*), the following are some suggested criteria you may wish to consider when you review a paper:

- **sophistication of the argument:** e.g. topic area is problematised; discussion has an obvious structure, moving from a general to more focused theme(s), ideas are clearly/fully developed, circular reasoning is not used etc.;
- **appropriate methodology** (e.g., clear justification of why the methodology is chosen over alternative approaches);
- **clear, defined objectives and aims** (e.g., hypotheses/ research questions/objectives are stated);
- **valid conclusions** (e.g., claims are supported with evidence/references made to the literature);
- **clear, coherent text:** main ideas are obvious/understandable and presented in a logical, easy-to-follow manner; main themes are repeated/summarised; ideas are not “out-of-the-blue” i.e., they develop as a result of the discussion;
- **appropriate reference to relevant published literature** (e.g., major theoretical or empirical work in the field is not omitted);
- title of the paper reflects the study/central theme(s);
- minor to no grammar/spelling mistakes;
- appropriate use of scientific/academic voice;



- from what you can tell, **no material included in the submission is copyrighted** (e.g. scanned material from books or copied off the internet) **or plagiarised**;
- all figures and tables (and any appendices) have suitable titles and their sources are appropriately cited.

***Importantly, the specialist reviewer must check that the data presented is scientifically sound. Articles submitted to CJSP will possibly contain data cited from other sources. Please check that the source is reliable and the data has not been altered or tampered with for the purposes of supporting the authors' arguments.***

If you have any questions on the content of your review, please do not hesitate to contact the CJSP Editorial Board at [publications@cuspe.org](mailto:publications@cuspe.org).

### *Guidelines for Non-Specialist Reviewers*

The general aim of the non-specialist reviewer is to check whether the prospective article can be understood by a non-academic audience (i.e., in government/civil service).

Non-specialist reviewers will meet one or more of the following criteria:

- (essential) They do not have a specialist knowledge of the topic;
- (optional) They have sufficient knowledge of science-policy writing.

If you are concerned you are not qualified to be a non-specialist reviewer – for example if you have some specialist knowledge on the topic, or in case you don't think you would be able to review the article to an optimal standard – please raise the issue with the editor. Please feel free to suggest an alternative reviewer if appropriate.

In addition to addressing general questions mentioned in the instructions (i.e., How can this article be improved? What are its strengths? What are its weaknesses?), the following are some suggested criteria you may wish to consider when you review a paper:

- Effective communication to a range of educated but generalist audiences: *Do you know more about the topic after reading the article? Are you convinced by their argument? Would you be able to clearly describe this work to another non-specialist?*
- Clear, coherent text (e.g. main ideas are obvious/understandable and presented in a logical, easy-to-follow manner; main themes are repeated/summarised; ideas are not “out-of-the-blue”, i.e. they develop as a result of the discussion);
- Context specific or specialist terminology defined: *can the jargon be minimised in specific points?*



Cambridge  
Journal of  
Science  
& Policy

- Clear, defined objectives and aims (e.g., hypotheses/ research questions/objectives are stated);
- Is the text is well-supported by use of figures/tables? Are any figures and tables easy to interpret?
- Check for grammar/spelling mistakes and typos.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the CJSP Editorial Board at [publications@cuspe.org](mailto:publications@cuspe.org).