

## Call for Reviewers and Review Guidelines

We are in need of additional reviewers for *The Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities*. If you are interested in becoming a reviewer for JSESD, please contact the co-editors. Thank you for your willingness to serve. Your participation in the peer review process is a critical factor in the ability of the journal to publish timely, high-quality articles.

### Purpose:

The purpose of the *JSESD* is to provide a forum for presentation of research and practice in the field of science education as it relates to teaching students with disabilities and a vehicle for dissemination of information to practitioners in the field. Currently, *JSESD* publishes reports of research, practical information, position papers, letters to the editors, product reviews and resources to improve science education and services for students with disabilities or who are gifted.

### Quick Check:

1. Please check the Manuscript Review Form and note the due date for the review. If you will be unable to complete your review by this date, please return everything immediately.
2. Briefly review the enclosed copy of the Author Guidelines in order that your feedback will be consistent with the editorial policy established for *JSESD*.
3. Each reviewer is responsible for preparing and submitting an on-time review.

### Preparing your review:

Your manuscript review consists of two parts: (a) the Manuscript Review Form and (b) a written/typed evaluation of the manuscript. If necessary, comments may also be written on the manuscript. When you do receive a review, we greatly appreciate your prompt review of manuscript by the deadline indicated. This results in a timely turnaround to the authors. The editors will synthesize reviewer comments and return them to the author in a standard form.

(a). Please use the enclosed Manuscript Review Form as the first page of your review. Enter your hand-written responses using the 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale to indicate your ranking of the manuscript for reach time.

(b). On a separate sheet of paper, prepare a typed summary of your comments concerning **strengths** and **weaknesses** and how the manuscript could be improved in the areas of:

- perspectives on practice,
- content,
- writing,
- value to the professional literature, and
- originality.

Please ensure that your comments are suitable for forward to the author and are as supportive as possible. Do not include your name or other identifying information.

### Returning Your Review:

1. Attach your written review to the Manuscript Review Form.
2. Return a copy of the review either: L.K. Quinsland or Todd Pagano, Co-Editors.

**Notification:**

The co-editors will notify the first author of the disposition of his/her manuscript following peer review. Reviewers are encouraged to contact the co-editors with any questions, concerns, or comments about the peer review process or manuscripts they have received.

**MANUSCRIPT REVIEW**

When a manuscript is delivered to the *JSESD*, the editors review the manuscript and decide whether or not to accept the manuscript for peer review. Some of the reasons a manuscript may not be accepted for review: (a) the focus of the manuscript is outside the focus of the journal and/or (b) failure to follow the manuscript guidelines concerning length, format, and style. Manuscripts that are not accepted for peer review will be promptly returned so that authors can seek other avenues for publication.

Authors and reviewers are encouraged to contact the editorial offices any time during the review process regarding questions about the status of their manuscript.

**PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

Manuscripts submitted to *JSESD* go through a blind review process for selection. Typically, two to three reviewers will evaluate the manuscript, on the basis of (a) the importance of the topic, (b) originality, (c) clarity, (d) accuracy and validity of the content, (e) value of the contribution to the professional literature, (f) implications for science education and (g) quality of the writing. Each reviewer will make a

recommendation for or against publication. Typically this process takes 4-6 weeks.

The recommendations of the reviewers are forwarded to the co-editors. After reviewing these recommendations, the co-editors will make a decision concerning the manuscript: (a) decline the opportunity to publish, (b) request a revision with a stipulation for further peer review, (c) request a revision subject to additional review by *JSESD*, or (d) accept as is.

The editorial decision and rationale will be communicated in a letter to the first author.

If a manuscript receives a favorable review from reviewers and the editors concur with the decision, a tentative recommendation for publication is made. This recommendation is conditional upon specific revisions that must be made as well as the submission of supporting materials (described below). The information describes the process and timelines related to revisions, technical editing, production, and publication.

***Revisions***

Final decision to publish a manuscript is made after the satisfactory completion of revisions as outlined in the correspondence.

When a manuscript is accepted for publication, author(s) will be requested to provide a final-version electronic copy of their manuscript, tables, references, and all figures.

***Technical Editing***

The editorial staff of *JSESD* reserves the right to make editorial changes that do not materially affect the meaning of the text.