

Reviewer Report: Summary Sheet

(Note: This review sheet was adapted and modified from a review sheet available at journals@commongroundpublishing.com)

Manuscript Number _____

Score each item out of a range from 0 to 20. For a description of criteria, see the Reviewer Summary Guidelines on pages 2-4.

*Please note that the score and the “Suggestions for Rewriting and Comments” portions of this review sheet will be provided to the submission authors, and it will be done anonymously (i.e., the reviewer will not be identified). **If you make edits or comments on the actual document using track changes, please ensure that you are not identified (through initials, etc) as a default in the comments.***

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORE
1. Problem Statement and Conceptual Modeling	/20
2. Logical and Empirical Foundations/Research Methodology	/25
3. Explanatory Logic	/20
4. Implications and Applications	/20
5. Quality of Writing	/15
TOTAL SCORE %	/100

Please note that articles presented at the CEPA conference will be given 5 additional points to the final score. Additionally, in final decisions with equally scored articles, preference will be given to articles containing empirical research findings (qualitative and/or quantitative).

RECOMMENDATION

- ☐ ACCEPT (with no more than minor revisions)
- ☐ RESUBMIT (with major revisions)
- ☐ REJECT

The following are indicative score ranges:

- Accept : 70-100%
- Resubmit: 60-69%
- Reject: Below 60%

Reviewer Summary Guidelines

1. Problem Statement and Conceptual Model

- Is the problem and purpose of the study clearly stated?
- Does the topic add value to the literature in the fields of leadership, collaboration, mentoring and/or education?
- Does the article develop, apply, critique and/or test a coherent and cogent theoretical position, conceptual model, or hypothesis?
- Does the article make appropriate connections to existing theory and/or address competing arguments where needed?
- Are the key terms defined and consistent throughout?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

2. Logical and Empirical Foundations

- Does the article effectively distinguish between opinion and fact?
- Does the article provide evidence to support points presented as factual, and adequately document and reference sources?
- Does the article demonstrate a critical awareness of alternative or competing perspectives, approaches, and paradigms?
- Does the article attempt to avoid bias and present an objective argument?
- Are the cited sources relevant and relatively free of excessive bias? Is the review of the literature too broad or too narrow?
- If article involves an argumentative essay or proposal, is it logical and well organized, and does it adequately address the research question or thesis statement?
- Does the article make necessary or appropriate connections with existing theory?
- Does the article develop, apply, and/or test a coherent and cogent theoretical position or conceptual model?

3. Research Methodology

Note: The following guidelines are for qualitative or quantitative research papers only:

- Were the research design, procedures, instruments, and analysis adequate and appropriate to address the research question(s)?
- Were there clear statements as to whether the hypotheses were supported?
- Were conclusions adequately supported by the data and analysis? Were limitations discussed?

- Are the data and statistical findings clearly reported and presented in a standard scientific manner?
- In the discussion of findings, does the article make a clear distinction between conclusions supported by the present analysis and speculation? Is the article careful to not draw causal inference with correlational evidence?
- Does the article include suggestions for future research?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

4. Implications and Applications

- Does the article demonstrate the direct or indirect applicability, relevance, or effectiveness of the theme or argument presented and/or the data analyzed?
- Are insightful but practical applications suggested? Do such applications take into account limits of generalizability?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

5. Quality of Writing

- Is there a clear, articulate and well-organized presentation of the theme/argument/material?
- Does the article adhere to the scientific and/or essay standards of the appropriate discipline?
- Does the article properly reference and cite sources?
- What is the state of grammatical and/or spelling errors?

Note: If you will be recommending publication with revisions, please make specific suggestions or annotate errors in the text using a text editor such as "Track Changes" in word. Please ensure your changes are clearly distinguished from the author's original article.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS: