

California State University
Journal of Sustainability and Climate Change

Review Process and Criteria

Peer Reviewers:

The service of peer reviewers is vital to strengthening the validity, effectiveness, and appropriateness of the articles published in the CSU Journal of Sustainability and Climate Change (JSCC). With your help, we will be able to successfully publish high-quality articles and give authors the experience of incorporating professional critiques into their work. This page will provide general guidelines and information for potential reviewers, and the relevant rubrics that reviewers will be expected to complete.

Process:

CSU JSCC utilizes a double-blind peer review process. Once the review is complete, a copy of the reviewer's comments will be anonymously provided to the author to make their revisions. Authors will be given repeated chances to incorporate the recommendations into their manuscript. If the revisions are considerable and are not feasible to implement by the revision deadline, authors can resubmit their paper the next year. The goal of our process is for reviewers to help authors publish the highest quality work possible.

General Guidelines:

- Read the manuscript carefully and provide constructive feedback to the author(s) and editor. Focus on key points and add valuable perspectives and suggestions.
- Specificity is good but do not overly critique minutiae. Be helpful to the author by signifying directions for improvement.
- If there are spelling and grammar errors, provide some examples but do not feel the need to correct the entire paper; there are editors who focus on this. The most critical element will be the summary/conclusions of your review of the article.
- Feel free to express praise where applicable.
- Keep the review anonymous by not providing any information about yourself to anyone but the editors.
- Do not share, reproduce, distribute, or cite the article under review.
- Please complete the review within 3 weeks of manuscript receipt.
- **Conflict of Interest:** Do not review a proposal for which you may have a conflict of interest (COI). COI can be personal or institutional in nature, as illustrated below:

PERSONAL	INSTITUTIONAL
Co-author of a paper or project collaborator (within previous 48 months)	Current or previous employment (prior 12 months) or seeking employment
Co-edited journal or proceedings (within previous 24 months)	Award, honorarium, or travel payment from the PI's institution (prior 12 months)
Thesis advisor or thesis student	Officer or governing board
Family member or close friend	Any financial interest

Instructions:

Reviewers are asked to follow a three-step process for their reviews:

- 1) Provide a score for each section of the criteria box that matches the type of submission that is the subject of the review.
- 2) Select one recommendation
- 3) Prepare constructive written remarks to provide feedback to the author(s)

Manuscript Review Criteria, to be completed by the Reviewer and viewed by the Author(s):

	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A
Originality						
Significance established						
Literature Review (currency, sufficiency, fit)						
Methodology (appropriateness)						
Data Analysis (soundness, sophistication)						
Tables, Graphs, Charts						
Organization						
Grammar						
Clarity						

Guidelines for Reviewer Remarks to be shared with Author(s). Reviewer instructions are to upload this completed document using OPTION 1. The Reviewer's comments are expected to remain constructive and professional. It is recommended comments address the following themes:

- Strengths and contributions
- Required revisions and/or major concerns **referencing the page numbers and section titles.**
- Revision suggestions not essential to publication

REVIEWERS: Complete this table for comments to the Author.

AUTHOR(S): Complete this table with their responses for incorporation into their submission.

Comments from Reviewer	Responses from Author
<i>Sample Comment from Reviewer</i>	<i>Sample Response from Author</i>