

**Thank you for agreeing to review for *IFJP*! Your role in the evaluation process is invaluable. We are committed to a stimulating and useful review process for our authors no matter the final outcome. We hope you will find the suggestions below a helpful guide to writing your review.**

Confidential Comments for the Editors:

Please be frank: from the manuscript you have read, does it look like the author has the willingness and ability to make the suggested revisions? If you do not think so, then state that clearly here. Your comments to the author can be more moderated. The author will not see this information unless you ALSO put it in the comments for the author. It is fine to copy and paste from the “Confidential Comments for the Editors” section to the “Comments to the Author” section.

Comments to the Author:

**Position your review as an honest, critical, and supportive analysis of the current state and future potential of the piece.** The more explicit the review is about strengths and weaknesses, the more helpful it will be to the author and the editorial process. Your assessment should clearly signal whether you believe the piece could eventually be published in *IFJP*, even if *this* version is not ready.

**Offer positive points first.** Establish the value of the piece – it might help to restate the author’s main argument or thesis, and to say to which field/s it contributes. Is it offering a new element of this field, or extending current knowledge? Does it bring new insights, sources, and/or connections to light?

**Encourage the author to foreground whatever new/innovative perspectives/methodologies they are presenting.** And also why and how they contribute significantly to the theoretical literature or a better understanding of the field of inquiry.

**When offering criticism, clarify what you think the author is trying to do but perhaps does not do as well as they might.** Offer advice for this paper, on the merit of its argument, rather than offering a new argument. This gives the author some “thinking space” to consider whether they are getting their central point/s across (or whether they mean something else entirely).

**Guide the author to specific works of relevant literature.** If it seems as if more reflection or analysis is needed on particular theoretical, conceptual, or empirical/historical elements, specify these and some key texts of those fields if they are known to you.

**Be as specific as possible.** It is very helpful to the author to cite individual page numbers when offering suggestions, including on any aspects of written expression that could be improved. If you decide to annotate the piece directly, be sure to make your comments anonymous.