

# Reviewing Guidelines

An opportunity to review is a chance to work cooperatively and constructively with authors and editors. Reviewing is an integral part of Pearson's process and requires conscientiousness and a methodical approach to work that can be both challenging and rewarding. The expertise of a reviewer is vital for the quality of our products and the guidelines given below form the backbone of our editorial work.

## 1. OBJECTIVITY

Manuscripts should be evaluated on the bases of the veracity of facts, the internal logic of the manuscript, the quality of writing and the relevance to its intended audience. A manuscript should not be reviewed on the basis of whether it supports or rejects the personal opinions of the reviewer or a prominent author. The intellectual independence of the author deserves respect.

Our editorial team removes the authors' names and their affiliations manuscripts sent for review; nevertheless, the reviewer should put aside any personal biases when examining a manuscript.

## 2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

When a manuscript is closely related to a reviewer's own work in progress or published work, a conflict of interest may arise, in which case the reviewer should return the manuscript immediately. A conflict of interest is also possible if the manuscript is authored or co-authored by a person with whom the reviewer has a personal or professional connection. When in doubt, please contact the respective editor at Pearson.

## 3. WHAT REVIEWERS SHOULD LOOK FOR

- Does the text or illustrations contain any errors of fact, interpretation, or calculation?
- Have the authors made appropriate citations of their sources? Are quotations of reasonable length, and used only to support the authors' statements? Could any parts of the manuscript be considered as dual publication—i.e. is it substantially similar to another work by the same author? Are there any instances of plagiarism?
- Is the manuscript too long? Is it too short? Should parts be deleted or condensed? Should some sections be expanded?

## 4. PROVIDE BOTH YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSION AND A LIST OF POINT-BY-POINT COMMENTS

Some reviewers prefer to make point-by-point, sentence-by-sentence, page-by-page comments corresponding with a linear reading of the manuscript. Whereas such reviews might be detailed and even exhaustive, they sometimes criticize topics that may actually be dealt with satisfactorily later in the manuscript. Without an overall impression, the reviewer's actual evaluation of the manuscript becomes indiscernible. We, thus, encourage our reviewers to provide both an overall impression and a list of point-by-point comments.

## 5. LIST THE MANUSCRIPT'S STRENGTHS

A listing of all the alleged problems in the manuscript is not only disheartening to the author, but may also be counter-productive. It would be more helpful if a list of the manuscript's strengths were also included; not only would it be more palatable to the author, but would also indicate the areas that could be improved.

Simply stating that the manuscript needs to be rewritten is not much of a review, and especially unhelpful if it is true. There are many ways in which a manuscript can be rewritten, and a reviewer should be specific as to what does and does not need attention.

## **6. LOCATE THE PARTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT TO WHICH YOU ARE REFERRING**

Reviewers should provide page numbers, direct quotes, or similarly pinpoint the areas they have commented on. This allows editors and authors to respond to the precise areas that need their attention.

For example:

In the third paragraph on page 9, the argument contradicts the author's earlier assertions.

## **7. CONFIDENTIALITY**

Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author. If this information invalidates to any extent the reviewer's own work, the reviewer, however, could ethically discontinue the work. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the reviewer to write to the author, with a copy to the editor, about the reviewer's research and plans in that area.

## **8. SCHEDULES**

Reviews should be submitted within the period specified by the editor. A reviewer should report any possibility of a delay to the concerned editor as early as possible to allow for rescheduling or replanning.