

Important Information

JIRR's review process is double masked (double blind), meaning that authors do not know who is reviewing their work and reviewers do not know who authored their submission(s). To preserve the anonymity of our review process, **please do not discuss any details of your submission(s) or attempt to identify author(s)**. Revised submissions must be complete and uploaded to OJS by midnight on **March 11th**.

Recommended Process for Reviewing

1. Once you gain access to the submission, check the document to make sure that it's readable. If you encounter any basic issues with the document, email [Hannah Anderson](#).
2. Read through the entire submission. Make note of the key points and anything about the submission that stands out to you. We recommend reading through your submission(s) and starting to review before attending the reviewer training session.
3. Look over the Review Framework. Read your submission again, making notes in each section of the framework as you go. Use the framework to identify and comment on specific strengths and weaknesses of the submission. Keep in mind that we will send your completed framework to the author of the submission. If you are providing in-line comments on the submission, ensure that your comments are properly anonymized. If you need help with anonymization, [send us an email](#).
4. Fill out the Reviewer Letter (below) and decide on your designation for the submission, considering the submission's strengths and potential revisions. The framework is not intended to provide a quantitative evaluation of the submission. Rather, use your judgement based on the quality of the submission, and alignment with the traits in the Review Framework. Re-read the submission and review your notes on the framework as necessary. The Review Letter will also be sent to the author.
The designation categories are as follows:
 - *Decline*: submission is not suitable for publication in JIRR. You may choose this designation because the submission is not well-suited for JIRR or because it is generally of such poor quality that it would require massive restructuring or re-writing to be acceptable.
 - *Resubmit for review*: the submission will not be accepted to this edition of JIRR but may, with major revisions, be suitable for a future edition. This designation indicates potential.
 - *Accept with revisions*: the submission is overall strong and well-suited to JIRR, but would benefit from revisions before publication. This is called "*Revisions Required*" on OJS.
 - *Accept*: an exemplary submission well-suited for publication. There may be some revisions or suggestions to further improve it, but these should not be significant or extensive.
5. Login into our OJS website and upload all review documents: (1) the completed framework, (2) your review letter, and (3) the original submission with your inline comments if you want to share them with the author. Please use the **Editor Comments** to record your confidence level and justification for your confidence level.
6. If a submission you review is accepted to JIRR, you may decide to give your contact information to its author to assist them with their revisions.

For questions about reviewing, contact your mentor reviewer. You may reveal details of the submission to your mentor reviewer as is necessary for their advising you. If you require additional assistance, visit this site <https://openjournalssystem.com/ojs-3-user-guide/reviewing-process/> or contact [JIRR's managing editors](#).

Review Letter Expectations

A complete Review Letter should have three main components: a summary of the submission, overarching comments, and a general evaluation. The letter should be submitted as a single PDF or Word document.

The submission summary concisely describes the submission.

This should include:

- The **central issue** or problem the submission addresses;
- The **ways of knowing** involved, which can be disciplinary, stakeholder, or situated, e.g., physics, ecology, indigenous ways of knowing, identity as a disabled person;
- What academic **conversations** in the literature or problem space is the submission a part of?
- The **argument or position** of the submission (note: for more exploratory works, a summary of the investigation and discussion may be more appropriate);
- The **methods, data, and integrative practices** involved (see Framework for details);
- The **insights, conclusions**, or questions for further research.

Overarching comments

- We expect these to be about anything consistent or significant within the submission. This is **not limited to critiques -- strengths of the submission should be discussed** to provide a review aligned with the recommendation.
- The main purpose of this section is to assist the author in knowing what they should continue to do well and how they should revise. As such, keep this section focused on **constructive suggestions**. For multimedia submissions, this is a good place to discuss or explain your creative critique.
- The recommendations you provide **will structure the author's revisions** before the submission can be accepted to JIRR. Ensure you are respectful throughout.

The general evaluation justifies your recommendation of the submission's suitability for JIRR. **Please do not state your recommended submission designation anywhere in the Reviewer Letter.** This section should answer the following questions:

- What **contributions** to the problem or surrounding scholarship does it make?
- Why is the submission **relevant** to JIRR? (Feel free to consult the submission guidelines at jirr.ca, under For Authors.)
- What are the **strengths** of the submission?
- What **hesitations** do you have about the submission, and what **suggestions** do you have to address them?
- Does the submission leave you with any **remaining questions**?

Submission Designation Instructions

Enter your confidence in your recommendation, in the Editor Comments box in OJS. Select your recommended submission designation from the drop down menu. This will not be sent to the author, only the Editorial Board.

- **Recommendation:** Accept, accept with revisions, resubmit for review, or decline.
- **Confidence Level:** Confidence in your recommendation for the submission from 1-7, and justification for your stated confidence level. Justification may include your familiarity with the involved disciplines or ways of knowing, understanding of the submission's language and structure, practice with involved methods, values and biases, or anything else you feel is relevant.
 - 1 = I am very unsure about my understanding of and recommendations for the submission.
 - 3 = I am confident in some of my understanding of the submission and recommendations.
 - 5 = I am quite confident in my understanding, critiques, and recommendations.
 - 7 = I am highly confident in my recommendation for the submission.