**First, please ensure you understand the journal’s current aims and scope**, available at: <http://newprairiepress.org/jac/about.html>. The editor screens submissions for suitability, but if you have concerns about the submission’s relevance, please email editor@journalofappliedcommunications.org.

**Second, please read the manuscript in its entirety** to understand its context within the discipline, rigor, contributions, and importance.

**Next, evaluate the manuscript using the criteria** in the table provided on the following pages. **Provide specific positive comments and constructive criticism, and refer to line numbers, when appropriate.** When constructing comments, consider the following points adapted from Jones[[1]](#footnote-1):

* Use your comments to the author as an opportunity to seek explanation on any unclear points and for further elaboration.
* Please make suggestions as to how the author can improve clarity, succinctness, and the overall quality of presentation of the manuscript.
* Confirm whether you believe the subject of the paper is sufficiently interesting to justify its length; if you recommend shortening the piece, it is useful to author(s) if you can indicate explicit areas where you believe shortening will benefit the manuscript’s impact (or similar language).
* It is not the job of the reviewer to edit the paper for technical writing and mechanics (such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, and syntax), but it is helpful if you correct language where the technical meaning is or may be unclear. If you do notice a few errors, making note of them is greatly appreciated by authors and the editorial board. As an open-access journal, we do not have editing services available.
* Reviewers may disagree with author(s’) opinions, but should allow them to stand, provided the author’s opinions are consistent with the evidence provided.
* Remember, authors will welcome positive feedback as well as constructive criticism from you as a reviewer.

Being critical whilst remaining sensitive to the author isn’t always easy and comments should be carefully constructed so that the author fully understands what actions they need to take to improve their paper. For example, generalized or vague statements should be avoided along with any negative comments which aren’t relevant or constructive.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Comments to Author(s) (use the manuscript’s line numbers, when appropriate)** |
| How original is the submission? Or, does it provide an important re-examination of an earlier study (e.g., replication study)? |  |
| How well does the manuscript fit the scope of the journal? In what ways would it interest academics and/or communication practitioners with interest in agricultural communication? |  |
| How well does the manuscript’s introduction address the study’s context and demonstrate a compelling need for the research? |  |
| How well does the study build on previous work? |  |
| Is the theory, conceptual framework, and/or literature review well-suited to the research? What changes should be considered, if any? |  |
| Given the larger context of the paper, are the purpose and objectives/research questions/hypotheses appropriate and clear? |  |
| Is the methods presented appropriate to address the stated purpose? Is it accurately employed and explained in sufficient detail? |  |
| How clear is the presentation of findings? Are data accurate and complete with all appropriate evidence provided?  |  |
| How well is the significance of the study’s findings discussed in the context of relevant literature? Do the implications have a solid basis in the findings? |  |
| Are recommendations for future research and practice clear, complete, and compelling? |  |
| Overall, do you judge the significance and potential impact of the manuscript to be high, moderate, or low? Please explain. |  |
| Please indicate any APA style errors in the manuscript. Also, please identify writing/grammatical errors noted or whether you would recommend significant work on the writing mechanics. |  |
| **Enter your decision onto the journal’s website when you login to submit your review. The context of each decision type is detailed here.** | **Accept** – if the paper is suitable for publication in its current form.**Accept with Minor Revisions** – if the paper will be appropriate for publication after minimal revisions. **Major Revisions Required** – if the paper would benefit from substantial changes such as expanded data analysis, significant widening of or substitutions to the literature review, or rewriting sections of the text.**Reject** – if the paper is not suitable for publication with this journal or if the revisions that would need to be undertaken are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form |
| Upload this completed template/file when you log onto the review system. There, you will also have the opportunity to write and submit confidential comments that only go to the editor. |
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