

JCI Review guidelines

(Version 2.1 2023-10-08)

Dear reviewers,

We appreciate your commitment to upholding the quality and integrity of the *Journal of Contemporary ISTDP*. As members of our review team, your role is pivotal in ensuring that the articles we publish are both scientifically sound and presented in a reader-friendly manner. In addition to assessing the scientific merits of submissions, we kindly request that you consider the tone and manner of your feedback to foster a positive and collaborative atmosphere between reviewers and authors.

Review structure

The reviews generally should have two parts. In the first part, general comments about the texts, including positive and negative feedback on the overall structure and line of reasoning is to be provided. This part of the review should include a section towards the end where you clearly state if you think that the article should be *accepted*, *accepted with minor revision*, *be revised* or be *rejected*. Please provide a motivation for your recommendation.

In the second part of the review, detailed feedback is provided either in the form of a list or in the form of a commented manuscript. Please send the review in a common format (.docx).

Review criteria

When evaluating submissions, please focus on the following four criteria:

Scientific rigor and creativity

Assess the overall validity of the author's topic, including the originality and creativity of their research or ideas. Evaluate the clarity of the author's objectives and the overall conciseness of their argument. Encourage authors to present their points clearly and succinctly.

Context

Examine how well the author places their theme into the broader context of the field. Is the importance of the topic adequately highlighted? Encourage authors to engage with relevant literature and provide constructive suggestions for any gaps or improvements. Please note that both the "Transcript type" and the "Viewpoint type" articles have a more loosely held format where references and literature review can be kept to a minimum.

Alternative views

Assess the author's handling of alternative perspectives and differing opinions. Encourage authors to acknowledge and address opposing viewpoints where appropriate. Offer constructive feedback on how the author can enhance the presentation of alternative views, fostering a more balanced discussion.

Language

Scrutinize the quality of the author's writing, paying attention to language accuracy and organization. Identify any areas where clarity could be improved. Provide specific feedback on language and writing style, making suggestions for enhanced readability without undermining the rigor of the content.

Tone of feedback

In addition to these scientific criteria, we strongly encourage reviewers to adopt a friendly and supportive tone in their feedback. Remember that your role is not just to critique but to guide and nurture authors. Here are some guidelines for fostering a positive rapport with authors.

- **Tone:** Approach your review with respect for the author's efforts and the potential merits of their work. Avoid language that might come across as condescending or dismissive.
- **Balance:** Start your review with positive comments to highlight the strengths of the submission. Then, gently transition into areas that need improvement. Criticism will be more effective when authors know what they are doing well.
- **Suggestion:** Frame your suggestions as recommendations rather than absolute directives. Authors should feel empowered to make choices in line with their expertise.
- **Specificity:** Be specific in your feedback, pointing out particular sections or issues that need attention. Offer concrete suggestions for improvement where possible.
- **Encouragement:** Emphasize that your feedback is intended to help authors enhance their work. Encourage them to resubmit their revised manuscript after addressing your suggestions.

By following these guidelines, we aim to create a supportive and constructive environment for authors, fostering their growth. Your efforts in providing both scientifically rigorous and friendly feedback are deeply appreciated.

Thank you for your dedication to the advancement of science in general and specifically to the advancement of the ISTDP community.

Thomas
Editor-in-chief