Reviewer Guidelines for The
Kennesaw Journal of
Undergraduate Research
(*KJUR*)

Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer for The Kennesaw Journal of Undergraduate Research. The journal could not exist without your efforts. Below, we describe the reviewing process in more detail.

General Guidelines
In general, the most important thing to remember is that you are reviewing a manuscript written by an undergraduate. Feedback should always be constructive and not punitive; however, that doesn't mean that you shouldn't point out the problems that you see in a manuscript. We simply encourage you to approach your feedback with an eye toward being helpful and constructive.

Papers submitted to *KJUR* often vary considerably in terms of quality due to the fact that it is undergraduate research. We know that your time is valuable, and we do not want you to spend an inordinate amount of time on any individual paper. If you are spending more than an hour reviewing a manuscript, it may suggest that the paper needs extensive revisions and that you should point out the major problems in general rather than doing extensive copyediting.

What You'll Need to Submit
    1. A decision recommendation of:
        a. Reject this article without an option to resubmit.
        b. Encourage major revisions as described in my report.
        c. Accept this article with minor (or no) revisions as described in my report.
    2. A review of the submission for the student:
        a. Do not include your name on this review as we like to keep our reviewers anonymous.
        b. Do not include your decision in your document as we like to keep that hidden from the authors. Your decision is included, however, as a separate part of submitting your review and will be seen by the editor.
        c. Your review can take the form of annotations on the submission, a separate word document summary, or even a text summary written within your *KJUR* reviewer panel.
        d. For rejection decisions, you should only provide a brief statement that provides the student with some constructive feedback. Please do not feel the need to identify every error.
        e. For major revision decisions, you should summarize any major problems and note single instances of errors. Please also note any positive feedback.
        f. For minor revision decisions, you should identify each error and also provide brief positive feedback.
    3. A summary of your decision recommendation for the editors. If you feel that the student should perform revisions, please summarize those revisions for the editor.

You may of course copy your summary descriptions from this document!

Your Decision
When you submit your review, you will be asked to make one of three recommendations for this manuscript:

• **Reject this article.**
  A manuscript receives this designation when it clearly does not meet the standards of a professional research paper in the student's discipline. Papers with this designation typically have egregious errors in some or all of the following areas:
  - o There are major problems with citations and/or plagiarism.
  - o The paper does not represent "undergraduate research," and this issue cannot be fixed even with a resubmission.
    - ▪ A general definition of undergraduate research (from the Council on Undergraduate Research) can be used: "An inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate student that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline" (https://www.cur.org/who/organization/mission/).
    - ▪ A common example of a submission that does not fit this definition would be an editorial or opinion piece.
  - o The paper contains three or more of the errors noted in the "major revisions" section.

• **Encourage major revisions as described in my report.**
  A manuscript receives this designation when the research shows promise but there are significant errors that make the paper unpublishable at the present time. In our experience, a paper requires major revisions if it contains some of the following examples along with a handful of minor critiques (note that this list is not exhaustive):
  - o There are pervasive writing errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling) that make the paper difficult to read and understand.
  - o The paper is not written using a formal, professional tone (for instance, the student has interjected opinions when he/she should have reviewed past research). Typically, the student will continuously use an informal tone.
  - o There are major errors in the formatting style for the student's field (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago).
  - o The paper doesn't fully conform to the conventions of a research paper in the student's discipline. The examples below refer to empirical research papers (a large number of *KJUR* submissions are empirical in nature):
    - ▪ The student has written an empirical research paper that does not have a Discussion section or that has only one paragraph for the Discussion section.
    - ▪ The student has written an empirical research paper in which the introduction section consists of paragraph-long summaries of each article the student read rather than being organized topically and leading to a specific research question or hypothesis.
    - ▪ There are issues regarding the data analyses the student

conducted; you may ask that the student conduct more analyses, different analyses, or collect more data to fully address the research question.

- The paper is missing important details that would help you fully evaluate it. For example:
  - The student missed some literature that pertains to the research question.
  - The student failed to include enough detail about methodology to fully evaluate the project.
  - The student did not fully explain the analyses and how those analyses address the research question(s) or hypotheses.

- **Accept this article with minor (or no) revisions as described in my report.** A manuscript receives this designation when the research represents a quality undergraduate project in the student's discipline. There may be some minor errors in the paper, but those errors would be relatively easily corrected by the student. A reviewer who gives this recommendation is confident that the student would be able to make the suggested corrections within the 8-week timeframe for making revisions.