

## Reviewers Checklist

Revised January 2008

The following table is intended to assist both Reviewers and Authors.

For Authors: use these guidelines to determine whether we will have an interest in publishing your work. As the author of this work, you are responsible for having it reviewed by your peers. The reviewer must be of higher or equal rank: if the author is Assistant Professor, the Reviewers must be an Associate or Full Professor, if the author is an Associate Professor, the reviewers must be Associate or Full Professor.

For Reviewers: In order to create a sense of full “ownership” for reviewers’ opinions and judgment and in order to foster cooperative and collegial relationship between scholars, SIME journal will require a narrative from you, as the reviewer, detailing the basis for recommending that the work you have reviewed be published. In other words, is this work original, substantive, uniquely informative? We may decide to **publish your review appended to the Article**.

In addition to the narrative part, please evaluate it as to whether it passes these simple test highlighted in the following statements. Please email us, directly and confidentially, the completed form. (See appropriate Editor’s email address at <http://majalla.org>).

<b>Title of the Work:</b>				
<b>Quality Statements</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.</b> The manuscript deals with a significant topic.				
<b>2.</b> The content of the manuscript is original.				
<b>3.</b> The author included the appropriate background or literature review.				
<b>4.</b> The author's writing style is clear, academic, and appropriate.				
<b>5.</b> The study is conceptually sound and theoretically grounded.				
<b>6.</b> The analyses of data are sound and appropriate.				
<b>7.</b> The conclusions and/or implications flow from the study's findings.				
<b>8.</b> This work will inform and educate specialized scholars and graduate students.				
<b>9.</b> This work will educate and inform all readers.				
<p><b>10. Evaluation of the Work:</b> Please write one or two short paragraphs summarizing the work, highlighting its significance, and contextualizing its contribution. This narrative (no more than 300 words) may be edited and published with the article. We believe this approach will encourage reviewers to take active role in guiding the author in revising and improving their work before it is published.</p> <p>&gt;</p>				

REVIEWER'S NAME & EMAIL:

**Suggestions for Reviewers and Authors:**

- To ensure quality of reviews and uniformity among reviewers, the journal asks each reviewer to make appropriate comments within the body of the paper and to respond to the Checklist. The comments within the body of the paper are to be sent to the author.
- While reviewing, if you're feeling frustrated and stressed out, you're probably writing the paper yourself instead of reviewing.
- In cases where English is not the author's native language, please continue correcting or let your Editorial Intern complete it.