REVIEWER GUIDELINES FOR *MTO* SUBMISSIONS

Sample structure of a review:

The structure below is offered as an optional template. At minimum, we need a recommendation and a list of major concerns. You may also add comments for the editors not to be shared with the author(s).

1. Summary
2. Main strengths of the article
3. Major concerns
4. Minor issues (small errors and proofreading corrections; give par. #s or page #s)
5. Recommendation:
   • acceptance outright
   • acceptance contingent on minor revisions
   • revise and resubmit (article is promising but significant revisions are needed; you will be asked to review the revised version, although this review can be briefer than the initial review)
   • rejection (unpromising or unsuitable; please identify the problems that led to your rejection)

General issues:

Timeliness: Please submit the review on time. Our quick turnaround is one of the most attractive aspects of MTO for authors—especially pre-tenure authors. If you need more time to complete your review, you may ask for 1 or 2 more weeks, but if you cannot do the review within that timeframe, please let us know as soon as possible so that we can reassign the submission without further delays.

Tone: In your report, please be constructive and kind. Be specific and detailed about your recommendations, and give examples illustrating your comments. Whenever you can, identify possible ways to fix problems, not just the problems themselves. Avoid addressing authors directly as "you."

Length: There is no set length for reviews, but at least 1–2 pages are expected. We not uncommonly receive reviews that are several single-spaced pages long, which are especially helpful to new authors.

Questions you may wish to consider (this list is optional and not exhaustive):

Topic and introduction: Is the article appropriate for the journal? Is the article's thesis clearly stated? Does this research make a new contribution to the field? Does the author make a convincing case for the usefulness, importance, and interest of this research? Do the title, abstract and introduction accurately reflect the article's contents?

Scholarly context: Does the article engage with current research on the topic? Does the author clearly identify the article's new contribution in light of this research? Are there any conspicuous omissions of important and relevant works?

Body of the article: Does the article's text bear out its thesis? Are the claims overstated or understated, and are they convincingly supported with evidence? Is the methodology appropriate? Are the analyses or other interpretations correct or at least potentially convincing? Are the conclusions justified? Does the author demonstrate the article's claims or merely assert them?

Supporting materials: Are there examples where needed? Are there superfluous examples? Are the citations adequate and appropriate? Are direct quotations or other specific information left uncited? Are the footnotes excessive or overly tangential?

Organization and length: Is the article clearly organized? Does the order of topics make sense, or should anything be reordered? Is there a logical flow of topics, or are there large digressions that should be omitted? Is the article of sufficient length to treat its topic adequately? Should it be expanded or cut down?

Writing: Is the writing style sufficiently formal and the prose adequately correct and polished?