



Dear Reviewer,

Thank you in advance for agreeing to review the following article. We ask people who have been either in-person or virtual presenters at the conference, and who have submitted an article for publication in one of our journals, to review up to three other papers for each submission that they have made.

This is an important role. You belong to a community of scholars, educators, and practitioners who provide critical and constructive feedback on the work to their peers. Reviewers will be credited as Associate Editors for the volume of the journal to which they have contributed (although, of course, the particular articles that they reviewed will not be identified).

The file is in Microsoft Word format. Each file commences with this letter, followed by the peer review report, and then the paper itself.

To referee papers, the process is as follows:

- Read the 'Peer Review Guidelines' and 'General Requirements,' which can be found on the website. ([First click on the relevant knowledge community from the link provided](#) and then follow the navigation: Submitting Your Work -> Journal Articles -> Submission Process)
- Read the article and complete the reviewer report form within this document.
- Make annotations to the article, using a method that clearly differentiates your text from the author's, such as block letters, different colored text, or the "Track Changes" function in Microsoft Word. We anonymize reports before returning them to the author. If your name appears as the commenter, we will delete your identifying information.
- Upload the completed report in CGPublisher, using the same link where you downloaded the original report. When uploading the completed report, you will be requested to include the total score and a recommendation decision for publication.
- **Deadline:** Reports should be returned within two weeks after this invitation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me by email if you have any questions about the refereeing process. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

The Common Ground Publishing Team
journals@commongroundpublishing.com

Reviewer Report: Summary Sheet

Score each item out of on a range from 0 to 20. For a description of criteria, see the SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS section which commences on the next page.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORE
1. Empirical Grounding	/20
2. Conceptual Modeling	/20
3. Explanatory Logic	/20
4. Implications and Applications	/20
5. Quality of Communication	/20
TOTAL SCORE %	/100

RECOMMENDATION

ACCEPT (with no more than minor revisions)

RESUBMIT (with major revisions)

REJECT

The following are indicative score ranges:

- Accept : 75-100%
- Resubmit: 60-75%
- Reject: Below 60%

SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS

1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding

- Is this a topic that needs addressing? Is the area investigated by the article: significant? timely? important? in need of addressing because it has been neglected? intrinsically interesting? filling a gap in current knowledge?
- Are data collection processes, textual analyses, or exegeses of practice sufficient and adequate to answer the research questions?
- Does the article adequately document, acknowledge, and reference the existing findings, research, practices and literature in its field?
- Does the article relate in a coherent and cogent way with issues of real-world significance?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

2. Conceptual Model

- Are the main concepts or categories appropriate to the investigation? Should other concepts or categories have been considered?
- Are key concepts adequately defined? Are they used consistently?
- Does the article make necessary or appropriate connections with existing theory?
- Does the article develop, apply, and test a coherent and cogent theoretical position or conceptual model?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

3. Explanatory Logic

- How effectively does the article reason from its empirical reference points?
- Are the conclusions drawn from the data, texts, sources, or represented objects clear and insightful? Do they effectively advance the themes that the article sets out to address?
- Does the article demonstrate a critical awareness of alternative or competing perspectives, approaches, and paradigms?
- Is the author conscious of his/her own premises and perhaps the limitations of his/her perspectives and knowledge-making processes?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

4. Implications and Applications

- Does the article demonstrate the direct or indirect applicability, relevance, or effectiveness of the practice or object it analyzes?
- Are its implications practicable? Are its recommendations realistic?
- Does the article make an original contribution to knowledge? To what extent does it break new intellectual ground?
- Does it suggest innovative applications? What are its prospects for broader applicability or appreciation? How might its vision for the world be realized more widely?

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

5. Quality of Communication

- Is the focus of the article clearly stated (for instance, the problem, issue, or object under investigation; the research question; or the theoretical problem)?
- Does the article clearly express its case, measured against the standards of the technical language of its field and the reading capacities of an academic, tertiary student, and professional audiences?
- What is the standard of the writing, including spelling and grammar? If you will be recommending publication with revisions, please make specific suggestions or annotate errors in the text.

IMPORTANT, PLEASE INDICATE:

From an editorial point of view, this article is of a publishable standard as is.

This article requires minor proofing by a colleague or critical friend of the author.

This article requires thorough reworking by a professional editor.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWRITING AND COMMENTS:

PAPER FOR REVIEW

Following is the article for review. If you, as reviewer, wish to annotate the text, please indicate with an 'X' as follows:

[] I have not annotated the text.

[] I have annotated the text. The method of annotation that I have used is:

*Please indicate here the way in which you have annotated the text, for instance, **BLOCK LETTERS**, or **red text**, or by using the 'track changes' function in Microsoft Word (—we will remove your identifying information before sending your report to the author).*

Comments and critical suggestions on the content and structure of this review format are most welcome.