



## *Journal of Appalachian Studies* Reviewer Guidelines

This journal's ability to contribute to knowledge about the Appalachian region depends on the integrity and quality of the peer review process of submitted manuscripts. This process, in turn, relies on the thought and time that a reviewer invests into a manuscript. If you are selected as a reviewer, please know that *JAS* very much appreciates your investment.

*JAS* uses a double-blind anonymous peer review system, which means that the author will not know who is reviewing her/his manuscript. Neither should you know the identity of the author. This is the best way to assure fairness. We trust you not to take extra measures, such as the use of internet search engines, to identify the author.

We expect reviewers to review works assigned to them in a timely fashion. The due date for reviews is *four weeks* from the date that the reviewer receives the manuscript and reviewer forms.

We expect reviews to address the following questions about the merits of the manuscript including, but not limited to:

- Does the manuscript address an interesting and important research problem or question or make an interesting and important argument relevant to Appalachia / Appalachian Studies?
- Does the manuscript contribute to the accumulation of knowledge or challenge existing understandings of Appalachia?
- Does the manuscript demonstrate sound theory, methods, interpretation, and/or argumentation?
- Is the analysis, interpretation or argument based on adequate evidence or data?
- Does the manuscript engage the relevant literature from Appalachian Studies as well as literature from other interdisciplinary or disciplinary literature?
- Does the manuscript effectively communicate its contribution to a broad readership?
- Is the scholarship described in the manuscript innovative?

We also ask you to recommend whether the manuscript should be published in *JAS*, by choosing one of the following options:

- **Accept, as is:** Make this recommendation only when you can see no need for revision or improvement of the manuscript.
- **Accept, subject to revisions:** Specify required revisions in your review.
- **Revise and resubmit:** Make this recommendation only when the scholarship and manuscript fundamentals are sound (e.g., the theory, models, arguments and conclusions are strong, the evidence is complete, and the appropriate literature has been reviewed) *and* when you are reasonably

certain that a successful revision and re-review seems plausible within 2-3 months' time. Also, specify the required revisions in your review. **Note:** The editor will assume that you are willing to re-review manuscripts you have placed in this category *unless* you indicate otherwise in your review.

- **Reject:** Explain why this manuscript should be rejected. **Note:** The editor will assume that you are *not* willing to re-review manuscripts you have placed in this category *unless* you indicate otherwise in your review.

***Please note that reviews are advisory to the Editor.***

You should not review a manuscript if you recognize its author (for example, doctoral dissertation students, co-authors, colleagues, relatives or close friends). An individual who reviewed the manuscript for another journal is not automatically disqualified as a reviewer for JAS.

Questions regarding the review process can be addressed to Mary K. Thomas (Managing Editor) or Christopher Leadingham (Assistant Managing Editor) by phone at (304) 696-2904 or e-mail at [asa@marshall.edu](mailto:asa@marshall.edu).