

## Notes for reviewers of articles submitted to Compare

- General for publication in Compare, papers should be of a consistently high quality.
- They should be well structured and clearly written, original and up-to-date.
- They should be analytical and not purely descriptive. Papers should present discussion of theories, issues, implications of research etc, in a manner which makes them interesting to a wide international audience, even when they focus on the situation in individual countries. All papers should include a comparative dimension. We consider 'comparative' in its widest sense, not just as a comparison between countries, but perhaps between institutions, across time or between educational philosophies. Before sending the paper to you, the editors have ensured that it has a comparative dimension - but you may want to recommend to the author that this is made more explicit. Your overview and textual comments should be constructive and framed in a positive way, such that we can send them directly to authors. They should be clearly legible, preferably typed. If you are recommending major or minor revisions, please ensure that you give clear suggestions as to the revisions required (possibly in the form of a numbered list). To preserve anonymity, please do not use headed notepaper or sign your name.

***Turn round: it is important that you return your comments to the Editors within a specified four-week period. If there is likely to be a delay, please let us know.***

A. Please type your report in an impersonal style suitable for sending directly to the author. An affirmative and positive approach to feedback will be the most encouraging for the recipient.

B. It is particularly useful if you provide detailed comments on those parts of the paper which are to be revised, and the nature and extent of such revision. Most papers will require some revisions, in which case they will be returned to you for further consideration before publication. Please note that we do not allow authors more than one opportunity to rewrite the article so would not encourage detailed comments on a second version if you feel it has still not reached the standard for publication. However, minor editorial suggestions may be made at this point if you are recommending publication.

C. In your review, please could you:

1. Estimate the importance of the general area of the article (whether is it currently popular, neglected, passé, etc.)
2. Comment on the fairness, accuracy and relevance in reviews of previous research, indicating any important omissions.
3. Indicate the appropriateness of the ways in which the author augments this body of knowledge.

4. Assess the extent to which the author's interpretations and conclusions are warranted by the evidence adduced.

5. Appraise the clarity of the argument and the quality of presentation.

6. Indicate a recommendation from the following:

\* Straight acceptance: article can be published straight away with only minor editorial amendments (no need for further reviewer input)

\* Return for minor revisions: article needs to be revised slightly in form and/or content according to the reviewers' recommendations (original reviewers and editor will check the article again before publication)

\* Return for major revisions: this is an invitation to rewrite and resubmit the article and acceptance is conditional on the extent to which the author has addressed the comments of the reviewers. Reviewers will carefully assess the paper a second time to see whether their concerns have been adequately dealt with.

Where reviewers do not feel that their comments have been adequately dealt with, this will result in the article being rejected. Where they have been, the article will be accepted (in some cases with minor editorial changes).

\* Reject outright: the reviewers do not consider that this article could be revised adequately in order to meet the criteria for publication. The author is not invited to resubmit the paper.

Although we do not expect referees to give detailed corrections relating to grammar, spelling or punctuation, we would ask you please to indicate where these seem noticeably deficient. Finally, please state clearly why you reject a particular paper. While the publisher assumes responsibility, it would also be helpful if you were to indicate any concerns that the material may be libellous, plagiarised, or an infringement of copyright.