

Alexander Studies Online

Guidelines for Community Review

Working draft

Contents

Purpose of the guidelines.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Scope	2
Confidentiality	2
Civility and Author Standards	2
Destination of material.....	2
Types of material.....	2
Selection of reviewers	3
Purpose and scope of community review	3
Purpose.....	3
Scope	3
Guidelines for reviewers.....	4
Use of language	4
Title [and sub-title]	4
Abstract	4
Main body of contribution	4
Structure.....	4
Scholarship	4
Conclusions.....	5
Supplementary Material.....	6
Further Information.....	6
Disclaimer	6
Document History.....	6
Copyright of this Agreement	6
Creative Commons Licence	6

Purpose of the guidelines

1. This document is intended to help contributors to Alexander Studies Online review submissions by other ASO contributors through the ASO “community review” process.

Introduction

Scope

2. This document offers guidelines only for **community review**, which needs to be distinguished from **community commentary** and **open commentary**. The first occurs at the **pre-publication** stage; the last two occur at the **post-publication** stage. There is a significant difference between the input expected in either case.
3. The possible options and applicable terminology can be seen in the matrix below and are discussed in more detail at: www.alexanderstudies.org/collaboration/peer-review-and-commentary and www.alexanderstudies.org/community-and-open-commentary.

	STAGE	
ACCESSIBILITY	Pre-publication	Post-publication
Restricted to Contributors	Community review	Community commentary
Open to all	-	Open commentary

Confidentiality

4. A key attribute of community review is that the material is posted in an area of the website that is only accessible to people who have been accredited by ASO as Contributors. **All the material in this restricted area must be treated as confidential amongst the accredited Contributors in perpetuity** (allowing Contributors to discuss material amongst themselves, but not with non-Contributors).
5. Confidentiality applies equally to the target contribution, to the community review and to responses by the author of the target article.

Civility and Author Standards

6. High standards of civility are expected in any review or responses to reviews. Please refer to the [ASO Standards for Authors](#), which are applicable to all reviews and commentaries.

Destination of material

7. Material offered for community review may not be destined to be published by ASO. We encourage contributors to seek publication of their material by the more widely circulated print or online journals of the main Alexander societies. Where an author is clear about their preferred route to publication we ask them to let us know and this will be publicised to the peer commentators so they can assess the suitability of the target contribution for the proposed readership.

Types of material

8. There is no restriction on the type of material that may be submitted for community review. The *Guidelines* are framed as if the target material is an essay, research paper or research proposal: common sense is required to adjust the criteria for other types of material.

Selection of reviewers

9. With community review, all our Contributors are able to offer feedback (whilst there is no expectation that they should do so). Community reviewers thus self-select. This can be contrasted with traditional peer review where the reviewers are invited by the editorial team.

Purpose and scope of community review

Purpose

10. The aim of the community review process is to ensure the highest standard of material that can reasonably be achieved by cultivating:
 - **robustness**
 - **originality**
 - **significance**
11. More specifically:
 - the main focus is on **robustness** (comprising qualities such as accuracy, validity, reliability), i.e. to address technical issues in the broadest sense from the minor (e.g. typographical errors) through to major issues of methodology and misunderstanding of other material;
 - there is a lesser focus on **originality**, but it is important to identify where previous contributions may not have been addressed or sufficiently taken into account;
 - the **significance** (including such as aspects as the importance or appropriateness of the material, the strength of the argument) should certainly be addressed pre-publication, but there is no expectation that the author need agree with the critique.

Scope

12. We do not ask reviewers arrive at a global rating for a contribution (as may often be the case with traditional peer reviews), i.e., we do not ask reviewers to arrive at a balanced judgement, from an editorial perspective, about whether the target contribution should be published or not, or whether a “major” or “minor” revision would be appropriate.

Guidelines for reviewers

Use of language

- A. Check for:
 - A1 spelling mistakes
 - A2 ambiguities
 - A3 poor grammar
 - A4 misused terms
 - A5 terms that are not self-evident but lack explanation
- B. Are there novel uses of terminology: if so, are these appropriate and justified?

Title [and sub-title]

- C. Do the title [and sub-title] reasonably reflect the topic area under discussion?

Abstract

- D. Does the abstract conform to length requirements (maximum 200 words for an article or essay or paper, 400 words for a monograph of 35 or more pages)?
- E. Does the abstract cover the main areas required i.e.:
 - E1 context: problem definition (what is the problem being addressed?); the current state of the field (existing literature or ideas)?
 - E2 methods / procedure /approach?
 - E3 results or main argument?
 - E4 conclusions?

Main body of contribution

Structure

- F. Does the organisation of the contribution follow the broad outline indicated above for abstracts?
- G. Should any topics be added, lengthened, deleted, or shortened to make the work more readable, coherent, or complete?

Scholarship

- H. Has previously published material been taken into account and where appropriate referenced?
- I. Are the references correct?
- J. Is the content factually accurate?
- K. Are the methods used sound?
- L. For scientific / experimental material:
 - L1 are/were the methods used appropriate?
 - L2 are/were the methods described clearly enough for other researchers to replicate?
 - L3 are/were the methods of statistical analysis and level of significance appropriate?

M. Are presentational aspects suitably clear i.e.

M1 tables?

M2 figures?

M3 diagrams?

N. For research involving humans (and animals!) have ethical issues been adequately addressed including confidentiality and where necessary ethics committee approval?

O. Are the arguments / conclusions

O1 logical?

O2 supported by the evidence?

P. Have alternative explanations or arguments been adequately considered?

Conclusions

Q. Are the conclusions reasonable in the context of the material presented?

R. Are there further implications that are not considered but should be?

S. Have the practical implications for the Alexander Technique been sufficiently addressed across the following domains:

S1 technique (i.e. the individual practice of the Alexander Technique)?

S2 promotion?

S3 pedagogy (teaching others)?

S4 professionalism?

S5 institutional and organisational aspects?

S6 teacher training?

Supplementary Material

Further Information

For further information about this document contact:

David Gibbens

editor@alexanderstudies.org

Disclaimer

No warranty is given to any person whomsoever as to the appropriateness for any purpose whatsoever of any of the content of these *Guidelines*.

Document History

First published under the title *Guidelines for Peer Commentary*.

See <http://www.alexanderstudies.org/node/4104>

Copyright of this Agreement

Copyright David Gibbens © 2015

Creative Commons Licence



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).