

Reviewer Guide/Message

Peer Reviewers,

First, on behalf of the Editorial Board, thank you for volunteering your time to review and support contributions to the Graduate History Online Journal. Your reviews are indispensable to our goal of publishing the best journal we can, with the highest standards of academic rigor possible.

Second, to maintain the integrity of the peer review process and our double-blind standard, please disclose any and all potential sources of conflict of interest to the Editor. A conflict is any interests or connections which might lead to a biased review of the current work. A conflict does not necessarily disqualify someone from being a reviewer. Following disclosure, the Journal Editorial Board will determine if a change in assignment is necessary. Potential conflicts that should be disclosed include (but are not limited to):

- Knowing the identity of the author despite anonymization
- If you feel this work contradicts or overlaps with your own previous or ongoing research
- Personal relationships with the author
- Academic competition with the author

Finally, your primary responsibility as a reviewer is to evaluate your assigned submission and make a recommendation to the Editor to (1) Publish the work, (2) Publish with minor revisions, (3) Revise and Resubmit, or (4) Reject. A reviewer should also clarify the reasons for their evaluation as clearly as possible, for the benefit of both the Editor and the author (particularly for options 2, 3, and 4). While making your evaluations and suggestions please remember the goal of this journal is to simultaneously publish strong, intriguing historical research while also supporting the education and training of graduate-level historians-in-training. The following document should serve to inform and guide your evaluation of your assigned submission(s) as well as the specific feedback and suggestions you might make otherwise.

Final Recommendations for paper under review:

- ☐ Accept
- ☐ Accept with minor revisions
- ☐ Revise and resubmit
- ☐ Reject

Evaluation Criteria & Guide (What should you be looking for, as a peer reviewer?):

1. **Argumentation & Originality:** Articulate an original argument, critical analysis, and complexity of reasoning in writing. Is the argument stated clearly?

2. **Primary Sources:** Use, integrate, and discuss primary source evidence effectively to support a historical argument. Does the author focus their argument on the primary sources listed? Do they cite enough primary sources?
3. **Secondary Sources:** Use, integrate, and discuss secondary sources and historiography effectively to support and contextualize a historical argument. Does the author refer to secondary sources throughout the paper? Does the author adequately develop the historiographic context? Are they adding enough historical context?
4. **Method & Theory:** Use, integrate, and discuss methodological, conceptual and theoretical approaches. Are the complex methods and theories well defined?
5. **Writing Mechanics:** Use proper writing mechanics, appropriate authoritative voice, and active verbs/sentence structures. Is the paper grammatically correct?
6. **Clarity:** Is the paper written in a clear and concise manner? Does it flow nicely? Does the author use good syntax and grammar?
7. **Complete Chicago Style citations and formatting (17th or 18th):** Is work formatted consistently according to Chicago Style guide? Is the author consistent with Chicago Style citations?

Constructive Criticism and Specific Suggestions:

- Be constructive, start with good points made throughout the paper
- Be specific, when giving criticism identify particular areas, paragraphs, or phrases which need attention
- For broader issues or suggestions, some specific representative examples should be identified for clarity.
- Avoid suggesting substantial, wholesale changes or additions to the work, or identifying subjects/topics or questions you might consider ‘missing.’ Interpret the work within its own parameters.
- Remember that you are not responsible for fixing the whole paper
 - Your suggestions are to support the publishing of this work by the original author and to support their growth as a historian.
- Be respectful, remember these are your fellow peers.

Thank you,

The Editorial Board