

## Instruction to referees of the Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal

There are two formats for publication:

1. Industry Forum – non refereed
2. Research Forum - refereed

### ***Industry Forum – non refereed***

The editor will review each submission to determine whether it is suitable. The aim of this part of the *REIS Journal* is to provide a forum for practitioners and academics to share their experiences and practical innovations with others in the field of agricultural extension and farm management. The focus therefore is on informal accessible articles that document not only successes but also failures and the lessons that from professionals' experiences.

The criteria for assessing this will be whether it provides potentially useful information to members of the APEN network about rural extension and innovation systems and the quality of the writing and presentation. If suitable, the editor may send it to a person with the appropriate expertise for comment, or to the assistant editors for improvements in presentation. If required it will be returned to the author with suggestions for revision.

### ***Extension Farming Systems Research – refereed***

The editor will give a preliminary assessment of each submission to determine whether it is suitable for REISJ. If is not suitable, the editor will either reject it or return it to the author with suggestions for substantial revision. If a submission passes this first cull, it will be sent to two reviewers on the REIS Review Panel. A blind review process is used to assess papers.

The *REIS Journal* reflects the multidisciplinary character of APEN, encompassing work relevant to academic researchers and extension practitioners in agriculture, agribusiness and natural resource management. The Research Forum publishes peer-reviewed research into agricultural and natural resource change management, extension, development and innovation systems issues that follow a rigorous and recognised disciplinary research methodology. It is targeted at professional extension practitioners, researchers and educators. However, since its purpose is to provide a forum for extension practitioners to publish their work, a standard suitable for a refereed conference publication but in a slightly longer format is appropriate.

### **Criteria for review**

The criteria used to evaluate papers are similar to the criteria used for the AFBM Journal as published in Charry, Murray-Prior and Parton (2004, p. 3-4) and have been modified slightly below:

---

#### **Evaluation of the contents of the article**

This section evaluates whether:

1. The *title* of the paper makes sense, is informative and clear, concise and attractive. It is expected that the title will cover the argument of the article as a whole.
2. The *abstract* is concise, informative and embracing of all the necessary content. The abstract should convey the purpose of the study, materials and methods, highlights of results and conclusions in a simple though attractive manner to the reader.
3. The *introduction* informs the reader about the background to the topic and places the reader in the context of the issue under study; it identifies the critical issues that justify the topic and outlines the major components of the paper.

4. The *objectives* and/or *hypothesis* of the study are clear and achievable, and they properly encompass the problem statement of the paper.
5. The *conceptual framework* is supported by the theory or literature review, and provides evidence of the author's familiarity with the most up-to-date information about the topic.
6. The *methodological framework* is appropriate to the subject, and to the research paradigm under which the enquiry process was conducted. The techniques used for the analysis are applied thoroughly and suitably.
7. The *discussion of results* is set out clearly and logically, and is accompanied by adequate explanation and interpretation. The analysis is considered to be exhaustive.
8. The *conclusions* are relevant and cover the total set of key objectives described at the beginning of the paper.
9. The *scholarship* of the author is evident by the quality and quantity of relevant and recent references, and the integration of his/her own concepts with other authors' statements.

### **Evaluation of the relevance of the article**

This area evaluates whether the reviewer considers that:

10. The article fits the *scope of the journal*.
11. The article gives evidence of *independence and originality of thought and approach*.
12. The structure of the article, the conceptualisation and the critical analysis give sufficient evidence that the exercise has been carried out with *rigour*.

### **Evaluation of the article settings: style, layout and structure**

This section evaluates whether the requested *standards for layout, formatting, overall organisation and structuring of the contents* of the paper are as per the *EFS Journal*. Title and heading settings, use of capital letters, margins, captions of tables, figures, diagrams and plates; proper writing of formulas and acronyms; quality of the citations; quality of English usage and quality of paragraphs in terms of structure and connectedness to ensure a coherent argument are the main issues to be reviewed. The list of contents should be consistent with the first-level headings of the paper and it should be centred on the first page of the paper.

### **Score ranking**

The suggested ranges for evaluation of the paper are defined as: Poor (P); Acceptable or Average (A); Good or Above Average (G); Very Good (VG); plus Not Applicable (N/A).

---

### **Recommendation**

A form for conducting this evaluation is given at the end of this article. Using their ratings as a guide, the reviewer will make a recommendation to the editor as to whether the paper should be:

- accepted for publication
- accepted for publication subject to minor revision
- major revision and resubmission required
- rejected for publication

The editor will consider the reviewers' comments and recommendations in making the final publication decision. In some cases, the editor may decide to submit a revised article for another round of reviews.

Reviewers must respect the confidentiality of the process and are expected to respond in a timely fashion (i.e. less than six weeks).

**Paper Title:**

Paper Code:

P: Poor; A: Acceptable/Average; G: Good; VG: Very Good; NA: Not applicable

Evaluation of contents of the article. This section evaluates whether:		P	A	G	VG	NA
1	The <i>title</i> makes sense, is clear, attractive and concise. It covers the paper argument as a whole					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
2	The <i>abstract</i> is concise, informative and holistic. It conveys the purpose of the study, materials and methods, results and conclusions appropriately.					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
3	The <i>introduction</i> informs the reader about background to the topic, identifies the critical issues that justify the topic and outlines the major components of the paper					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
4	The <i>objectives and/or hypothesis</i> are clear and achievable, and they properly encompass the problem statement					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
5	The <i>conceptual framework</i> (i.e. literature support) evidences sufficient familiarity with up-to-date information about the topic					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
6	The <i>methodological framework</i> is appropriate to the subject of the paper and the techniques used are applied thoroughly and suitably					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
7	The <i>discussion of results</i> is set out clearly and logically and is accompanied by adequate exposition and interpretation. The analysis is exhaustive					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
8	The <i>conclusions</i> are relevant and cover the total set of key objectives of the paper					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						
9	The references offer good evidence of the <i>scholarship</i> of the author					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>						

<b>Relevance of the article.</b> This section evaluates whether you consider that	P	A	G	VG	NA
10 The article <i>fits the scope of the Journal</i>					
11 The article evidences <i>independence or originality of thought and approach</i>					
12 The structure of the article, conceptualisation and critical analysis give evidence that the research has been carried out with <i>rigour</i>					
<u>Comments:</u>					

<b>Evaluation of settings of the article.</b> This section evaluates whether;	P	A	G	VG	NA
13 The paper is consistent in terms of <u>requested standards</u> for layout, formatting, overall organisation and distribution of contents					
14 The length of the paper is appropriate (max 10 pages)					
15 The <u>tables</u> , <u>figures</u> and <u>plates</u> setting out is adequate (captions, numbering, source)					
16 The <u>citations</u> are set out in a proper manner					
17 The <u>paragraphs</u> have thematic unity and they build on each other to create a coherent argument					
18 The <u>language</u> expressions are plain and ideas are clearly expressed					
<u>Reasoning/suggestions for improvement:</u>					

**Recommendation:**

- Accepted for publication  
 Accepted for publication subject to minor revision  
 Major revision and resubmission required  
 Rejected for publication

**Reasons:****Any Additional Comments**