

PEER-REVIEW Guidelines

Abstracts + Papers

Overview:

The AMPS feedback form is a downloadable word document. Please download this before you start from the AMPS review webpage.

Our feedback form uses a checklist system and open-ended comments. We do appreciate the time involved in reviewing and, on that basis, it is not obligatory to give narrative commentary (but we do strongly request it).

Once you have reviewed your abstract or paper, please upload the completed feedback form on the AMPS review webpage and follow submission instructions.

Feedback checklist:

In addition to questions of content, relevance and quality, when filling out the checklist part of the feedback form, please pay attention to the following practical issues:

- **Wordcount** (The limit is 300 words for abstracts, and 3000 words for full papers. Longer texts are problematic for various production reasons)
- **Formatting** (The use of images, references and keywords in abstracts is discouraged. Full papers should follow the style guidelines we provide exactly)
- **Citation Style** (We use Chicago manual of Style Notes Bibliography 17th Edition. When reviewing papers please pay special attention to whether the author has followed this)

We request that you clearly indicate whether the abstract or paper in question follows these guidelines in the checklist area and, ideally, in the written comments.

Open-ended feedback.

- **A summary of content** (This is to help the conference/publication team better group papers together thematically)
- **Advice to the author** (This is particularly helpful where you feel the paper needs extra work to meet expected academic standards)
- **Opinion on theme** (If you feel the submission fits a particular conference/publication theme well (or does not align with the theme/topic), please indicate this clearly.)

Please make these comments in the additional comments section of the feedback form.

Review process - practicalities.

There are various steps in the feedback process for reviewers. This is a summary of the key issues and steps:

- **Read relevant documents** (To do the reviews effectively you should start by reading this form and the conference / publication call carefully)
- **Download and complete the feedback form** (This is a word doc. available on the AMPS review page)
- **Numbering reviews** (Please title the word doc. of your review with the number of the paper ie, if your abstract is numbered 12, your review should be titled: 12_Amps_Peer-review form)
- **Upload the completed form** (This is done on the AMPS review webpage. You should answer the few simple questions on this page and upload the completed word doc.)

Other issues.

- **Commitment** (We understand you have other commitments. If you cannot do the review, it is fine. Please let us know so we can source other reviewers)
- **Timeline** (We request abstract reviews back within 2 weeks of receiving/agreeing to the abstract for review / 4 weeks for full papers)
- **Blind Review Process** (We follow a double-blind peer review process. If you recognise the abstract you receive, or there is an error in making the abstract 'blind', please let us know and we will assign you a different paper)
- **Subject Expertise** (We understand some papers may be outside your area of expertise. However, to reflect our cross disciplinary readership we do prefer feedback from one reviewer who is not a subject specialist. Feel free to indicate this if it is your case)

Thank you for your support.