Review form for the Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal: Field Notes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**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 *title* makes sense, is clear, attractive & concise. It covers the arguments of the paper. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. The *abstract* is concise, informative & holistic. It details the purpose of the study, materials & methods, results & conclusions succinctly (150 words). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. The *structure* of the paper is logical, easy to follow and flows smoothly. The paper is presented in a way that clearly conveys the intended meaning. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. The article fits the *scope of the Practice section of the journal*. It provides potentially useful information to members of the APEN network and other rural advisory practitioners about rural extension and innovation systems practice. (This could include discussions of successes, failures, and lessons learned from experience.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. The *writing quality* is sufficient for publication. It is clear, informal and accessible to be understood by the reader. It includes appropriate grammar, spelling and word usage. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation of settings of the article.** This section evaluates whether: | P | A | G | VG | NA |
| 1. The paper is consistent in terms of requested standards for layout, formatting, overall organisation and distribution of contents. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The *length* of the paper is appropriate (max 6 pages) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The tables, figures and plates follow the journal style (captions, numbering, format, source) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The in-text citations and reference list are set out properly |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasoning/suggestions for improvement: | | | | | |

**Recommendation:** (Note: Right click on box & select Properties)

Accepted for publication

Accepted for publication subject to minor revision

Major revision and resubmission required

Rejected for publication

**Reasons and comments**:

# Instructions to reviewers of Practice papers for the *Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal*

The focus of the **Practice** section is to publish papers that tell stories; promote innovative ideas, tools and process; or provide comment on rural extension and innovation systems activities by or about working with people in (mainly rural) industries and communities to achieve change. The emphasis therefore is on informal accessible articles that document successes, but also failures and the lessons that arise from extension professionals’ experiences. It targets extension practitioners and educators, agribusiness managers, business consultants and professional farmers.

These papers are evaluated by the journal’s editorial staff and an industry panel on scholarship, readability, relevance to industry and likelihood of facilitating change. Papers/abstracts are initially screened by the Editor to determine whether the submission provides potentially useful information to members of the APEN network and other rural advisory practitioners about rural extension and innovation systems practices. If it is judged suitable, the submission will be sent to a person with the appropriate expertise for review/comment, based on the criteria below. If required it will be returned to the author with suggestions for revision.

## Criteria for review

The criteria used to evaluate papers are given below:

### Criteria for review

1. The title makes sense, is clear, attractive & concise. It covers the arguments of the paper.
2. The abstract is concise, informative & holistic. It details the purpose of the study, materials & methods, results & conclusions succinctly (150 words).
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 issue or problem that justify the topic and outlines the major components of the paper.
4. The article fits the scope of the Practice section of the journal. It provides potentially useful information to members of the APEN network and other rural advisory practitioners about rural extension and innovation systems practice. (This could include discussions of successes, failures, and lessons learned from experience.)
5. The writing quality is sufficient for publication. It is clear, informal and accessible to be understood by the reader. It includes appropriate grammar, spelling and word usage.
6. The paper follows the standards for layout and formatting as per the *Rural Extension and Innovation Systems Journal: Guidelines for authors of Practice articles*. 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. Further information on the style for referencing can be found from the UWA Harvard citation style available at <http://guides.is.uwa.edu.au/harvard>.

### Score ranking

The suggested ranges for evaluation of the criteria 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 above. 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 reviewer’s comments and recommendations in making the final publication decision. In some cases, the editor may decide the author should submit a revised article for another review.

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

1. You can find detailed instructions following this form [↑](#footnote-ref-1)