

Guidelines for Peer Reviewing a *Tapuya* Manuscript

Guidelines:

1. What is the argument of the manuscript? That is, why did the author write this manuscript? Is the argument visible in the abstract? To whom is it important? Researchers? Policy makers? Activists? Particular disciplines? etc...

2&3. What are the strengths and limitations of this manuscript? State these as briefly and clearly as possible. In addition to the above concerns:

- Who are the intended readers of this manuscript, whether or not the author specifies them?
(Sometimes authors are trying to address too many audiences at once.)
- Is the author fair to the sources cited, especially to those criticized?
- Are the issues addressed of concern today, or were they last of interest 15 years ago?
- Is the literature cited up to date, or is the last citation from 5 years ago?
- Are the methods appropriate ones for the questions asked and results of research reported?
Could additional or different methods be more revealing?
- Is "difference" appropriately addressed – race, class, gender, sexual orientation? (This may not always be relevant.)

4&5. What are the debates, disputes, or tensions within the fields of the manuscript? Are central terms used in conflicting ways? Do leading figures make conflicting assumptions about what the problem is? How is the manuscript making significant contributions to ongoing issues in the field? A good essay or book will make a progressive problem shift, showing how thinkers on both (or all) sides of the issues miss an important issue, one that will be identified and addressed by the author.

6. Briefly evaluate the writing. But do not take time to copyedit. The manuscript will almost always be revised, and the *Journal* has paid copyeditors.

- Is it well organized? Are topic shifts clear? Subheadings needed? Suggestions here would be helpful.
- Is it clear and comprehensible? If not, do you estimate that it can be made so?
- Suggest how to "tighten up" the argument, or develop it a bit further here or there.
- Is it longer than 7000 words, including notes? Suggest how to reduce to this limit.

7. Did the author follow the Taylor & Francis guidelines for submissions?

<https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=ttap20>

8&9. Advice to authors and editors. First, advice for authors. How could the author improve his/her argument? Keep suggestions for revision to two or three main points and a few smaller ones. Keep comments helpful – encouraging, friendly. No one likes to be criticized. Think about what you would like to know to improve the manuscript if it were yours.

Next, advice for editors. What should they know in order to make their decision? For all manuscripts sent out for peer review, *Tapuya* editors tentatively intend to work with authors to improve a manuscript that contains interesting material, even though it probably has obvious flaws, and also needs your expert advice. You are advising about one of the submissions that the editors thought promising, but certainly not flawless. The Editors have already rejected unpromising submissions before peer review. So please hesitate before advising “reject”, and do so only if you have thoroughly justified your opinion. If the editors decide to work with the author anyway in light of helpful advice from other peer reviewers, the official record of a reviewer “reject” complicates that process. The final decision whether to publish is the Editor in Chief’s.

10. Finally, we highly value your assessment. We look forward to being able to call on you in the future.