

Reviewing a Manuscript Using OJS

1. Requests to review a manuscript are sent to you by email. The email includes the following information:

- Title and abstract of the manuscript
- Manuscript file
- Due date to accept or decline the review request
- Due date for review feedback
- A link to the manuscript record in OJS; clicking on the link takes you directly to the manuscript page in OJS.

2. The Review process has 4 steps:

- Step 1: Review Request
- Step 2: Guidelines
- Step 3: Download & Review
- Step 4: Completion

3. In [Step 1: Review Request](#), you can

- See the Manuscript Title and Abstract
- Download the Manuscript (and other files relevant to the review process, if there are any)
- Check the Due Date for review feedback
- Accept or Decline the review request
 - To **Accept** the review assignment, check the box labeled “[Yes, I agree to have my data collected and stored according to the privacy statement](#)” and click on the Accept button (this will move you to [Step 2](#));
 - To **Decline** the review assignment, click on the red Decline link (doing so will send the Editor an automatically generated message noting that you have declined the assignment).

Yes, I agree to have my data collected and stored according to the [privacy statement](#).

Accept Review, Continue to Step #2

Decline Review Request

Note: If you must decline a request, please let us know as early as possible. This allows us to promptly send the manuscript to another review and avoid delays with the review process.

4. [Step 2: Guidelines](#) gives you an opportunity to read through the reviewer guidelines, if you'd like (the Guidelines are also included on p. 4 of this document). Click on the “Continue to Step #3” button to access the Review page.

5. [Step 3: Download and Review](#) allows you to

- Enter your review feedback. There are 2 options for doing this:
 - Option 1: You may **enter your comments in the dialog boxes** on the page:
 - In the top box, enter feedback directed to both the author(s) and editor (a label below the box identifies it as “for author and editor”).
 - In the lower box, enter feedback that is intended only for the editor (a label below the box identifies it as “for editor only”).

Tip: Please **do not** draft your feedback in the OJS dialog boxes, but do so in a word processor or similar application so that you can save your comments as you write. Then copy and paste your feedback in the dialog boxes. **We highly recommend this approach because if OJS crashes as you are entering comments in the box, they will be lost.**

- Option 2: You may **upload a file (Word, PDF, etc.) that contains your feedback**. Below the dialog boxes, there is an option to upload a file. You may either click on the [Search](#) button to navigate to your feedback file, or drag-and-drop the file from your computer into the file field.

Note: You can also use this option to upload a marked up version of the manuscript, if you prepare one in the course of reviewing the submission.

Upload

Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

Reviewer Files	Q Search	Upload File
No Files		

- In order to submit your feedback, you must select a Recommendation from the drop-down list in the box in the lower portion of the page.

Recommendation

Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Choose One

[Go Back](#)

- The list includes the following options:
 - Accept Submission
 - Revisions Required (“conditional accept”)
 - Resubmit for Review (“revise and resubmit”)
 - Resubmit Elsewhere
 - Decline Submission
 - See comments

Note: See the Reviewer Guidelines (p. 4 of this document) for brief descriptions of these options.

- After selecting the Recommendation, click on the [Submit Review](#) button.

- Note that the [Download and Review](#) page also allows you to
 - Download the manuscript (if needed) by clicking on the link at the top of the page;
 - Access the Reviewer Guidelines by clicking on the “Review Guidelines” link, just above the dialog boxes.

6. **Step 4: Completion** simply confirms that you have successfully submitted your review feedback. After you click on the [Submit Review](#) button in Step 3, you will move to Step 4 and see this message:



Review Submitted

Thank you for completing the review of this submission. Your review has been submitted successfully. We appreciate your contribution to the quality of the work that we publish; the editor may contact you again for more information if needed.

Review Discussions		Add discussion		
Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed

EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Guidelines for Review Feedback

Your feedback helps us in two ways. First, it is indispensable to the editor in making a fair determination regarding whether to publish this manuscript. Second, whether the essay is rejected or accepted, your comments provide valuable advice for the author to consider in improving his or her work. Even accepted papers typically go through further revision before publication — so your reviews play a direct role in improving the quality of the articles that appear in *Educational Theory*.

The reviews that are most helpful provide:

1. A global evaluation that is discerning — that doesn't just accept a paper because there's nothing much *wrong* with it, but asks, "Am I glad that I read this paper? Did I learn something from it? Will other people want to read it?"
2. A detailed assessment of the major arguments of the paper: where they are strong, where they are weak, and how they could be improved. Often reviewers can help authors strengthen their arguments by posing potential counterarguments, by suggesting alternative formulations of key positions, by suggesting areas for elaboration, and/or by pointing out additional sources that the author ought to read and consider.

It is also helpful to specify a recommendation. The recommendation options are:

- Accept submission (*may still suggest revisions*)
- Revisions Required (*accept only on condition that the author makes specified changes*)
- Resubmit for Review (*manuscript is of interest but requires substantial revision; reject in current form, but with revisions it could be worth reviewing again*)
- Resubmit elsewhere (*may suggest other journals*)
- Decline submission (*may still suggest areas needing improvement*)

In practice, the most difficult judgments are between "Revisions Required" and "Resubmit for Review." Once a paper is accepted on condition of making specific changes (i.e., receives a "Revisions Required" decision), it will almost certainly appear in the journal, so it must be fundamentally sound. Authors do not always follow all the recommendations for revision. A "Resubmit for Review" decision, on the other hand, establishes a greater expectation that there is likely to be additional review of the paper and that it will not be published unless the author makes the changes specified.

I take the reports from all the reviewers, along with my own review notes, and communicate a decision along with feedback to the authors. In most cases you will not see the same manuscript again unless I need to know whether you think the revisions address your concerns. In most cases I will make that determination myself, to relieve you of extra work.

Finally, please know that our review process is doubly anonymous: we do not tell the authors who the reviewers are, and as much as possible we try to shield the identity of the authors from the reviewer. If you think you can guess the author of a manuscript, however, that is not necessarily a disqualification from reviewing it.