



JOURNAL OF APPALACHIAN STUDIES **MANUSCRIPT REVIEW GUIDELINES**

This journal's ability to contribute to knowledge about the Appalachian region depends on the integrity and quality of the peer review process of submitted manuscripts. This process, in turn, relies on the thought and time that a reviewer invests into a manuscript. If you are selected as a reviewer, please know that *JAS* very much appreciates your investment.

JAS uses a double-blind anonymous peer review system, which means that the author will not know who is reviewing her/his manuscript. Neither should you know the identity of the author. This is the best way to assure fairness. We trust you not to take extra measures, such as the use of internet search engines, to identify the author.

We expect reviewers to review works assigned to them in a timely fashion. The due date for reviews is four weeks from the date that the reviewer receives the manuscript.

We expect reviews to address questions about the merits of the manuscript, including but not limited to the following:

- Does the manuscript address an interesting and important research problem or question or make an interesting and important argument relevant to Appalachia / Appalachian studies?

- Does the manuscript contribute to the accumulation of knowledge or challenge existing understandings of Appalachia?
- Does the manuscript demonstrate sound theory, methods, interpretation, and/or argumentation?
- Is the analysis, interpretation or argument based on adequate evidence or data?
- Does the manuscript engage the relevant literature from Appalachian studies as well as literature from other interdisciplinary or disciplinary literature?
- Does the manuscript effectively communicate its contribution to a broad readership?
- Is the scholarship described in the manuscript innovative?

We also ask you to recommend whether the manuscript should be published in JAS, by choosing one of the following options:

1. **Accept (as is)**: Make this recommendation only when you can see no need for revision or improvement of the manuscript.
2. **Revise and resubmit**: Make this recommendation only when the scholarship and manuscript fundamentals are sound (e.g., the theory, models, arguments, and conclusions are strong, the evidence is complete, and the appropriate literature has been reviewed) and when you are reasonably certain that a successful revision and re-review seems plausible within 2-3 months' time. Also, specify the required revisions in your review. Note: The editor will assume that you are willing to re-review manuscripts you have placed in this category unless you indicate otherwise in your review.
3. **Reject**: Explain why this manuscript should be rejected. Note: The editor will assume that you are not willing to re-review manuscripts you have placed in this category unless you indicate otherwise in your review.

You should not review a manuscript if you recognize its author (for example, doctoral dissertation students, co-authors, colleagues, relatives, or close

friends). An individual who reviewed the manuscript for another journal is not automatically disqualified as a reviewer for *JAS*. Please note that reviews are advisory to the editor.

Please visit Scholastica to access the submission and submit your review:
[Scholastica \(scholasticahq.com\)](http://scholasticahq.com)

Questions regarding the review process should be addressed to Ann E. Bryant, assistant managing editor, at mullins88@marshall.edu.