

# Reviewer Guidelines

Dear Reviewer:

As editors of the Journal of School Counseling, we would like to offer our sincere thanks to you for your hard work and commitment to the school counseling field by agreeing to be a reviewer for JSC. Practicing school counselors need quality publications that facilitate and guide their practice in school counseling. We appreciate your willingness to offer your editorial reviews of school counseling professionals.

When you receive a manuscript for review, we ask that you review the manuscript on two levels: General and Specific.

## General Review

- General review involves your written feedback to the authors. We have provided a sampling of questions for you to consider as you review the manuscript. These questions are only meant to guide your review: **You do not need to answer all of the questions for each manuscript.**
- The bolded headings represent sections or themes present in most manuscripts and should be considered (although may not require your comments or suggestions) during your review.
- The General review guideline includes sections/themes for *All Manuscripts* and some additional sections/themes for *Data-Based Manuscripts*.
  - ✓ If you receive a Position Paper or Innovations manuscript, you need only provide feedback related to the sections outlined in the *All Manuscripts* guideline.
  - ✓ If you receive a Qualitative or Quantitative manuscript, please include feedback related to the *All Manuscripts* and *Data-Based Manuscripts* sections.

## Specific Review

- Specific review involves your evaluation (acceptable, unacceptable, or uncertain) of numerous aspects of the manuscript. Please check all boxes on the form.
- We have provided you with a form that is appropriate for the type of manuscript being reviewed.
- At the bottom of each form is the Disposition section where you inform us regarding your conclusions about the acceptability of the manuscript for publication.

In the body of the manuscript, please make editorial suggestions using either a Yellow highlighting feature found in Microsoft Word and Corel WordPerfect, or bold font (preferably a larger size than that used by the author). This will allow us to email your suggestions directly back to the author.

When you complete your review please return to us:

1. The manuscript with your editorial comments/suggestions
2. Your General Review – written feedback
3. Your Specific Review – form check sheet

We look forward to providing a useful and professional publication for school counselors and we appreciate your contribution to this effort. If you have any questions, please contact us.

**Mark D. Nelson, Ed.D., Co-editor**

[markn@montana.edu](mailto:markn@montana.edu)

**Jill M. Thorngren, Ph.D., Co-editor**

[jilt@montana.edu](mailto:jilt@montana.edu)

# General Review

## ***All Manuscripts***

### **Presentation**

Does the paper relate a cohesive argument?  
Are the ideas clearly presented?

### **Writing**

Does the title characterize the manuscript?  
Is the writing concise and easy to follow?  
Is paper written in APA style?

### **Length**

What portions of the paper should be expanded? Removed? Condensed? Summarized?  
Combined?

### **Abstract and Introduction**

Do the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the points made in the paper?

### **Literature Review**

Is the literature review comprehensive?  
Does the literature review contain a coherent argument supported by literature (as opposed to a list of studies)?

### **Practical Implications/Limitations**

Does the author describe implications for school counselors?  
Does the author describe limitations of the research or drawbacks to the method or position described?

### **Directions for Future Research**

Does the author describe further need/areas for research or expansion of ideas?

### **Disposition**

#### ***Accept***

Publish this manuscript in its present form (i.e., no revisions necessary).

#### ***Accept with revisions***

This indicates that the paper will be accepted for publication provided the recommended revisions are made. State whether the revisions are minor or major in scope. Revisions should not significantly change the methodology or content of the paper. Papers in this category normally require:

- Minor revisions throughout the manuscript
- Easily correctable flaws in an otherwise appropriate analysis
- Basic or minor changes to concepts
- Reorganization of content to improve readability, expansion of citations

In this category, you may include a section entitled *Required Changes*; which outlines changes that are essential for the revised paper to be accepted. You may also choose to include a section entitled *Issues for your Consideration*; which outlines areas that could be improved but are not essential for publication.

#### ***Do not accept, but resubmission is encouraged***

The material may be worthy of publication in the journal following substantial revision. The needed revisions are extensive enough to warrant resubmission as a new paper.

### *Do not accept, resubmission is discouraged*

The material is not suitable for publication in the journal. Papers are often rejected for reasons such as:

- Serious flaws in experimental design
- Incorrect interpretation of data
- Inadequate data
- Inappropriateness for journal
- Lack of originality
- Treatment of an unimportant or trivial problem
- Inadequate or inappropriate citations.

If it is more suitable for publication in another journal, please state the name of the journal.

---

## ***Data-Based Manuscripts***

### **Methods for studies involving primary data collection**

Does the author provide enough detail of the methodology?

Are the methods described clearly enough to facilitate replication (where applicable)?

Is there a sound research methodology?

Are the methods appropriate?

### **Rationale & Research Question**

Is there sufficient rationale for the study?

Is the question under study clearly identified?

### **Data presentation**

Could the design be conveyed more easily?

Are the data clearly presented?

Can the reported results be verified easily by reference to tables and/or figures?

Would another form of presentation help?

Are illustrations instructive?

Are all tables and figures clearly labeled, necessary, and well-planned?

### **Analysis and Interpretation**

Are the analyses appropriate, logical, and described in enough detail?

Does the organization of results promote understanding?

### **Discussion**

Are the discussion and conclusions made by the author supported by the data?

Does the writer understand the limitations of the study?

Is there enough breadth and depth in the implications of the study?

## Specific Review: Quantitative Studies

Please determine the level of acceptability for each of the sub-section categories and indicate your response for each by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Uncertain
<b>Introduction</b>			
Sufficient rationale for study & design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research question	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Manuscript Components</b>			
Writing style, grammar, APA format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pertinent literature reviewed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lit. review is organized and focused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research reviewed and critiqued	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logical conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Method Section</b>			
Sample	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Instruments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statistics/Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Limitations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Results/Discussion</b>			
Conclusions properly discussed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Future research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implication/application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Disposition Recommendation:**

- Accept
- Accept with revisions
- Do not accept: Resubmission is encouraged
- Do not accept: Resubmission is discouraged

**Additional comments:**

## Specific Review: Qualitative Studies

Please determine the level of acceptability for each of the sub-section categories and indicate your response for each by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Uncertain
<b>Introduction</b>			
Sufficient rationale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research question	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Manuscript Components</b>			
Writing style, grammar, APA format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pertinent literature reviewed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lit. review is organized and focused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research reviewed and critiqued	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logical conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Method Section</b>			
Participants & setting described in detail	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data collection procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Researcher bias addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proper data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Validation procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Limitations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Results/Discussion</b>			
Identification of themes/patterns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Future research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implication/application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Disposition Recommendation:**

- Accept
- Accept with revisions
- Do not accept: Resubmission is encouraged
- Do not accept: Resubmission is discouraged

**Additional comments:**

## Specific Review: Position Papers

Please determine the level of acceptability for each of the sub-section categories and indicate your response for each by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Uncertain
<b>Introduction</b>			
Sufficient rationale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clear & concise purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Manuscript Components</b>			
Writing style, grammar, APA format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Compares/contrasts points of view	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pertinent and current literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review organized & focused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Theory/research reviewed & critiqued	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Topic is timely	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Discussion</b>			
Conclusions drawn logically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implications for school counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implications for research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Disposition Recommendation:**

- Accept
- Accept with revisions
- Do not accept: Resubmission is encouraged
- Do not accept: Resubmission is discouraged

**Additional comments:**

## Specific Review: Innovations

Please determine the level of acceptability for each of the sub-section categories and indicate your response for each by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Uncertain
<b>Introduction</b>			
Sufficient rationale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clear & concise purpose statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Manuscript Components</b>			
Writing style, grammar, APA format	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clearly stated goals/objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature review organized & focused	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Method</b>			
Clear/concise description of materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sufficient detail for implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Discussion</b>			
Conclusions drawn logically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical implications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Disposition Recommendation:

- Accept
- Accept with revisions
- Do not accept: Resubmission is encouraged
- Do not accept: Resubmission is discouraged

### Additional comments: