Alexander Studies Online
Guidelines for Community Review

Contents

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.

Terminology

3. A contribution that is subject to a review process is a 'Target Article'.

4. 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.

	Pre-publication stage	Post-publication stage
AVAILABILITY OF MATERIAL		
Circulated to individual peer reviewers only	Peer review	
Online access to commentary restricted to Contributors[1]	Community review	Community commentary
Online access open to all		Open commentary

Confidentiality

5. A Target Article may be confidential or non-confidential at the discretion of the author; but non-confidential publication is also subject to Editorial approval.

6. **All the feedback that forms part of the Community Review process is confidential in perpetuity.**

7. Contributors may discuss confidential material amongst themselves but not with non-Contributors; discussion may be on- or off-line (e.g. by telephone or email).

8. Where material is designated as confidential, it is published by ASO in such a way that access is restricted by the website software to people who are logged in and who have the necessary permissions.

Civility and Author Standards

9. High standards of civility are expected in any review or responses to reviews. Please refer to the ASO Standards for Authors, which include our Netiquette standards and which are applicable to all reviews and commentaries.

Destination of material

10. **Material offered for community review may not be destined for publication 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 reviewers so they can assess the

---

[1] The Target Article itself may or may not be confidential. See following section on Confidentiality.

suitability of the target article for the proposed readership. Such target articles will only be published confidentially.

Types of material

11.   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

12.   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.

Practicalities - Submission Guidelines

13.   For details about the practicalities of submitting material, whether a target article for review or a comment on a target article, and including processes and formatting requirements, refer to our *Submission Guidelines* webpage under the *More…>For Authors* menu.

Purpose and scope of community review

Purpose

14.   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**

15.   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) may certainly be addressed pre-publication, but there is no expectation that the author need agree with the critique.

Scope

16.   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

Purpose and audience

A. Are the intended audience and purpose of the contribution clear?

Use of language

B. Check for:

    B1   spelling mistakes

    B2   ambiguities

    B3   poor grammar

    B4   misused terms

    B5   terms that are not self-evident but lack explanation

C. Are there novel uses of terminology: if so, are these appropriate and justified?

D. Is the language appropriate given the intended audience and purpose of the contribution.

Title [and sub-title]

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

Abstract

F. 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)?

G. Does the abstract cover the main areas required i.e.:

    G1   context: problem definition (what is the problem being addressed?); the current state of the field (existing literature or ideas)?

    G2   methods / procedure /approach?

    G3   results or main argument?

    G4   conclusions?

Main body of contribution

Structure

H. Does the organisation of the contribution follow the broad outline indicated above for abstracts?

I. Should any topics be added, lengthened, deleted, or shortened to make the work more readable, coherent, or complete?

Scholarship

J. Has previously published material been taken into account and where appropriate referenced?

K. Are the references correct?

L. Is the content factually accurate?

M. For research material:

    M1   are/were the methods used appropriate?

    M2   are/were the methods described clearly enough for other researchers to replicate?

M3   are/were the methods of statistical analysis and level of significance appropriate?

N. Are presentational aspects suitably clear i.e.

    N1   tables?

    N2   figures?

    N3   diagrams?

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

P. Are the arguments

    P1   logical?

    P2   supported by the evidence?

    P3   consistent with current understanding or, if not, justifiable on the evidence presented?

Q. Have alternative explanations or arguments been adequately considered?

Conclusions

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

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

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

    T1   technique (i.e. the individual practice of the Alexander Technique)?

    T2   promotion?

    T3   pedagogy (teaching others)?

    T4   professionalism?

    T5   institutional and organisational aspects?

    T6   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/article/aso-guidelines-community-review for full document history and previous versions.

Copyright of this Agreement

Copyright David Gibbens © 2015, 2016. The moral rights of David Gibbens to be identified as the author have been asserted.

Creative Commons Licence

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.