**Guide for Reviewers –** [Developing Academic Practice](https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/eddev/journal/)

Reviewing for Developing Academic Practice is a very important collaborative process that allows independent reviewers to evaluate, in a constructive way, manuscript submissions. The review should be constructive to provide clear feedback for authors on how to improve their work and critically, to allow the Associate Editor and Editor to assess the suitability of the work for publication in Developing Academic Practice.

**Writing your report**

All reviews must be submitted using the online [Review for Paper Submissions](https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=MVElUymxEECG4UdL_X6AdgnrwF21kq9PgXTZeYtEeLBURE41QUFOT1QzVDNIWkI3MkhKVDhRVDJDVy4u) template. In compiling your report please ensure the following:

* Feedback is focused and constructive
* It is clear which of your concerns are major points and which are smaller issues which may not be as essential for publication
* You are specific in your feedback with examples where possible
* Make it easy for authors to follow your comments by adding page/line numbers where appropriate
* Please proof-read your feedback prior to submission and check for grammar and spelling
* Please take into account the nature of the submission (Reflective article, Case Study or Research Paper) and ensure that you are familiar with the guidelines for authors in relation to each of these formats
* Ensure that you are familiar with the author requirements for ethics, formatting and referencing so that you can comment appropriately

**Blind peer review**

Developing Academic Practice operates a blind peer review system, so all authors should have removed any personal information identifying themselves from their submission (including 'properties' from Word documents). If they have not, please let your designated Associate Editor know. If you feel you may have difficulty writing an objective review due to conflict of interest, please also let the designated Associate Editor know.

**Completing the Review for Paper Submissions**

***Please remember that the ethos of the journal is to be inclusive and provide a development opportunity for staff from a range of roles and disciplines to share their work.***

* **Consistency with the Journal Scope**

Developing Academic Practice is a peer-reviewed platform for the open access publication of research and practice in learning and teaching in Higher Education. The aims of the journal are to celebrate scholarship in all aspects of educational practice, and to provide an opportunity to celebrate innovative practice in Higher Education in an open, creative and collaborative publication. The journal offers a range of contributions from those engaged in Higher Education in the University of Liverpool and beyond.

* **Contribution to the Field**

In completing your review you should take into account the extent to which the article:

* Enhances understanding in the field
* Is original, sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication
* Has relevance to readers of Developing Academic Practice

**Reflective articles**

Reflective writing typically involves looking back at past experience to analyse what happened and why and sometimes incorporates models or theories. In this way, the pedagogical focus should be clear and have clear links to the focus of the discussion It is usual for the author to use personal language such as ‘I’ and ‘we’ to talk about observations, emotions and feelings. Comment on how well the author has offered constructive criticism of their own practice or that of others or certain events. You should also evaluate the extent to which the writer has offered a clear line of thought, using evidence or examples to illustrate their reflections with an analytical approach. They should strike a balance between their personal perspective, and the requirements of good academic practice and rigorous thinking. These articles can include implications and applications for practice.

**Case studies and research articles**

Consider the following questions when reviewing case studies and research articles:

***Title:*** Does it express what the piece is about? Does it emphasize the importance of the study?

***Abstract:*** Is it a short clear summary of aims, methods, findings and conclusion/recommendations? Can it stand alone and contain necessary information?

***Introduction***: Is it a clear summary of the current state of the topic? Does it explain why the study was necessary? Does it clearly state the aims and is this consistent with the rest of the article? Is the research question (s) clear?

***Methods***: Are the chosen methods suitable for the research question (s)? Is it clear how sampling took place? Has potential bias been considered? Have correct controls/ validation been included? Do you have any ethical concerns?

***Results***: Are these presented accurately? Do they match the methods and research questions? Has all relevant data been included? Have any figures and tables been used suitably and labelled/referenced correctly?

***Discussion and Conclusion***: Do the authors logically explain the findings? Are the implications of the results discussed and potential applications highlighted? Are conclusions and recommendations supported by the data?

References: Are any references missing? Do the cited references represent current knowledge?

**Timeliness of reviewing:**

Please complete your review in advance of the date that you have been provided, in agreement with your Associate Editor

**Expectations for reviewers:**

* We would normally expect reviewers to commit to conduct a follow up review of revised papers.
* We would expect reviewers to be involved in a maximum of two submissions per year.

Thank you very much for supporting Developing Academic Practice.