Review form for the Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal: Research[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Paper Title:**

**Paper Code**:

 P: Poor; A: Acceptable/Average; G: Good; VG: Very Good; NA: Not applicable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation of contents of the article**. This section evaluates whether: | P | A | G | VG | NA |
| The *title* makes sense, is clear, attractive & concise. It covers the arguments of the paper. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *abstract* is concise, informative & holistic. It details the purpose of the study, materials & methods, results & conclusions succinctly (150 words). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *introduction* informs the reader about background to the topic, identifies the critical issue or problem that justifies the topic & outlines the major components of the paper. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *objectives (research questions or hypotheses)* are clear & achievable, & properly encompass the problem statement.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *research approach* evidences sufficient familiarity with up-to-date information & theory about the topic, & is grounded in appropriate literature & references. The methods are appropriate to the subject, adequately described, free of weaknesses & the techniques are applied thoroughly & suitably. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *results* are set out clearly & logically & are accompanied by adequate exposition & interpretation. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *discussion* addresses research questions/hypotheses, is adequate & supported by the data and method, compares results with previous research and explains similarities/differences. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |
| The *conclusions* are relevant, justified & cover the total set of key objectives of the paper. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance of the article.** This section evaluates whether you consider: | P | A | G | VG | NA |
| The article fits the scope of the Journal |  |  |  |  |  |
| The article makes an important contribution to the field of investigation & provides valuable new information. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The structure of the article, conceptualisation and critical analysis give evidence that the research has been carried out with rigour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation of settings of the article.** This section evaluates whether: | P | A | G | VG | NA |
| The paper is consistent in terms of requested standards for layout, formatting, overall organisation and distribution of contents |  |  |  |  |  |
| The *length* of the paper is appropriate (max 7,500 words research & 5,000 words literature review papers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| The tables, figures and plates follow the journal style (captions, numbering, format, source) |  |  |  |  |  |
| The *in-text citations and reference list* are set out properly |  |  |  |  |  |
| The paragraphs have thematic unity and they build on each other to create a coherent argument |  |  |  |  |  |
| The language is clear with appropriate grammar, tense and spelling |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: |

**Recommendation:** (Note: Right click on box & select Properties)

**[ ]**  Accepted for publication

**[ ]**  Accepted for publication subject to minor revision

**[ ]**  Major revision and resubmission required

**[ ]**  Rejected for publication

**Reasons and comments**:

# Instructions to referees of Research papers for the *Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal*

The *REIS Journal* reflects the multidisciplinary character of APEN, encompassing work relevant to academic researchers and extension practitioners in agriculture, agribusiness and natural resource management. The Research section publishes peer-reviewed research into agricultural and natural resource change management, extension, development and innovation systems issues that follow a rigorous and recognised disciplinary research methodology. It is targeted at professional extension practitioners, researchers and educators. However, since its purpose is to provide a forum for extension practitioners to publish their work, a standard suitable for a refereed conference publication but in a slightly longer format is appropriate.

The editor will give a preliminary assessment of each submission to determine whether it is suitable for REISJ. If it is not suitable, the editor will either reject it or return it to the author with suggestions for substantial revision. If a submission passes this first cull, it will be sent to two reviewers on the REIS Review Panel who are experts in the agricultural extension field. A double-blind review process is used to assess papers.

If you have a potential conflict of interest in reviewing the paper please notify the editor. A definition of conflict of interest can be found in the Guidelines on Good Publication Practice by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). A conflict of interest is some financial or personal relationship that may be perceived to have influenced or biased the work. All articles should be treated confidentially.

## Criteria for review

The criteria used to evaluate papers are given below and should be considered objectively:

### Evaluation of the contents of the article

This section evaluates whether:

1. The titlemakes sense, is clear, attractive & concise. It covers the arguments of the paper. A title should not be too long and could give a flavour of the conclusions.

The abstract is concise, informative & holistic. It details the purpose of the study, materials & methods, results & conclusions succinctly (150 words).

The introduction informs the reader about the background to the topic and places the reader in the context of the issue under study; it identifies the critical issue or problem that justify the topic and outlines the major components of the paper.

The objectives and associated research questions or hypothesis of the study are clear and achievable, and they properly encompass the problem or issue addressed by the paper.

The research approach is based on sufficient familiarity with up-to-date information & theory about the topic, & is grounded in appropriate literature & references. The methods are appropriate to the subject, adequately described, free of weaknesses & the techniques are applied thoroughly & suitably.

The results are set out clearly & logically & are accompanied by adequate exposition & interpretation.

The discussion addresses research questions/hypotheses, is adequate & supported by the data and method, compares results with previous research and explains similarities/differences.

The conclusions are relevant & cover the total set of key objectives described at the beginning of the paper.

### Evaluation of the relevance of the article

This section assesses whether:

The article fits the scope of the journal.

The article makes an important contribution to the field of investigation & provides valuable new information.

The structure of the article, the conceptualisation and the critical analysis give sufficient evidence that the research has been carried out with rigour.

### Evaluation of the article settings: style, layout and structure

This section evaluates whether the requested *standards for layout, formatting, overall organisation and structuring of the contents* of the paper are as per the *Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal: Guidelines for authors of Research articles*, which is available from the journal web site given at the bottom of the page. Title and heading settings, use of capital letters, margins, captions of tables, figures, diagrams and plates; proper writing of formulas and acronyms; quality of the citations; quality of English usage and quality of paragraphs in terms of structure and connectedness to ensure a coherent argument are the main issues to be reviewed. Further information on the style for referencing can be found from the *UWA Harvard citation style* available at <http://guides.is.uwa.edu.au/harvard>.

### Score ranking

The suggested ranges for evaluation of the criteria are defined as: Poor (P); Acceptable or Average (A); Good or Above Average (G); Very Good (VG); plus Not Applicable (N/A).

## Recommendation

A form for conducting this evaluation is given above. Using your ratings as a guide, make a recommendation to the editor as to whether the paper should be:

* accepted for publication
* accepted for publication subject to minor revision
* major revision and resubmission required
* rejected for publication.

The editor will consider the reviewers’ comments and recommendations in making the final publication decision. In some cases, the editor may decide the author should to submit a revised article for another round of reviews.

Reviewers must respect the confidentiality of the process and are expected to respond in a timely fashion (i.e. less than four weeks).
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1. You can find detailed instructions following this form [↑](#footnote-ref-1)