

THE REVIEW PROCESS

All submitted manuscripts will be read by the Honors Manager. Manuscripts will then be sent for formal review, typically to two or three honors student reviewers. The editorial board of *Sabiduria* will then make a decision based on the reviewers' advice, either to:

- (1) Accept, with or without editorial revisions
- (2) Invite the authors to revise their manuscript to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached or
- (3) Reject

Referees can recommend a certain course of action but should bear in mind that other referees may have different opinions on the manuscript. The final decision will be made by the editorial board.

The most useful reports, therefore, provide the editors with the information on which a decision should be based. Setting out the arguments for and against publication is sometimes more helpful than a direct recommendation one way or the other.

SELECTING REFEREES

The Honors Manager will choose referees based on the reviewers' knowledge, interest, and field of study. Previous experience will also be taken into consideration; for instance, referees who are slow to return manuscripts, careless, overly harsh or overly lenient will be avoided.

WRITING THE REVIEW

The primary purpose of the review is to provide the editors with the information needed to reach a decision. However, referees should remember that the reviews themselves will be sent to the author. This is so the peer-review process will be a true learning experience for all parties. Considering this, the review itself should be written to accommodate both of these needs: first, so the editorial board can make a decision based on the review; and, second, so the author will know how to strengthen his/her research. A negative review should always explain to the author the major weaknesses and how the paper could be improved.

The ideal review will address the following questions:

(1) Is the topic defined enough to provide true insight into the question? Many topics are so broad that the author has no chance to offer an original viewpoint. Research manuscripts should always provide a novel way of looking at or analyzing a subject.

(2) Is the manuscript clearly written? If not, the referee should suggest how it may be made more clear or accessible.

(3) Is the organization efficient and logical and does it cover everything that it should? The reviewer should note when the author includes material that is extraneous or where vital theories, findings or data are excluded.

(4) Has the author adequately addressed the present literature on the subject? The referee should note when the author only cites sources that support his/her case. If the referee knows of specific work that should be consulted, that should be included in the review.

(5) If the manuscript includes statistical analysis, does it use sound methodology? If not, specifically address how the analysis can be improved.

In addition, the referee should be sure to list and explain **at least two or three strengths of the paper and at least two or three weaknesses**. This is especially helpful to the author.

CONFIDENTIALITY

We ask referees to treat the review process as strictly confidential, and not to discuss the manuscript with anyone not directly involved in the review. It is acceptable to consult with PBCC faculty about sources, methodology and other concerns / questions the referee may have. Referees should, however, consult with the Honors Manager before doing so

ANONYMITY

We do not release referees' identities to authors or to other referees. This is what makes the process "double-blind" and lends integrity. Referees should remain anonymous throughout the review process and beyond. Any attempt on the part of the author to confront referees or determine their identities may result in the suspension of the review process.

REFEREE RESPONSIBILITY

Referees should be prompt in reading the manuscript and returning the review. Ideally, the review should be returned to the Honors Manager within ten days of receipt. If referees anticipate a longer delay, we ask them to let us know so that we can keep the authors informed and, where necessary, find alternative referees.