

Guidelines for external peer reviewers

CJNS/RCEN relies heavily on external peer reviewers to ensure its content meets scholarly standards. We are very grateful to the many scholars from widely varying disciplines who give us the benefit of their time and expertise.

Peer review process

Our peer review process is double blind: the reviewer will not know the author's name, and the author will not know the reviewer's name, unless the reviewer requests that his/her name be made available to the author. If you think you know the author of the article (as sometimes happens especially in small fields), or if you feel you are in a conflict of interest, please let us know immediately. If you are unable to review the article, we appreciate your suggestions for possible alternate reviewers.

Peer review guidelines

If you have agreed to review a submission for us, please follow these guidelines in preparing your comments:

You will receive an anonymized PDF copy of the submission by email. This will have page and line numbers to make it easier for you to refer to the text in your comments. Please do NOT make your comments in the original document, but send your comments as a list, either in the body of an email or as a separate Word or PDF document.

In your comments, please address the following questions as appropriate:

1. Does the article present an interesting and important contribution to scholarship?
2. Is the article well structured and is the argument convincing?
3. Is the article generally well written in an appropriate style, readable for a non-specialist academic audience?
4. Does the article make appropriate use of primary literature or other primary data?
5. Does the article make appropriate use of existing scholarship on the subject (secondary literature)? Is the bibliography complete?

Please note: it is not necessary to comment on small issues such as referencing style, footnotes, spelling and grammar errors, or bibliographic formatting. Our copy editors take care of that aspect at a later stage.

In addition, please give us your recommendation with respect to an editorial decision:

1. Accept
2. Accept with revisions
3. Revise and resubmit
4. Reject

Please give your reasons for your recommendation, and if your recommendation is 2 or 3, please detail the necessary revisions.

Your comments will be passed on to the author. Please write them with the author in mind. Unnecessarily aggressive or negative comments will be summarized or reformulated before being passed on to the author. If you prefer that your name be made available to the author, please mention this in your reply email.

Deadlines

We appreciate receiving your comments within four weeks of receiving the article. If this presents a problem, please do not hesitate to contact the editor (cjns-editor@caans-acaen.ca) so we can work out a deadline that suits your other commitments.

We are very grateful for your assistance, without which an interdisciplinary journal like CJNS/RCEN would not be able to maintain the wide variety of subject areas in which it publishes.