**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 page and 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.
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| **Criteria** | **Comments to Author(s) (use the manuscript’s page and line numbers, when appropriate)** |
| 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? |  |
| Does the Commentary attempt to advance the field of agricultural communication by providing insights on one of the following: exploring or highlighting current trends in the field; making a recommendation or providing an opinion about the future of the discipline; identifying or exploring an issue of concern to the discipline (in teaching, research, or extension/service); and/or providing a professional and respectful criticism or extension of arguments from previously published material in the Journal? |  |
| How well does the Commentary provide evidence (using data, literature, reasoned opinion, etc.) and sound logic to support the assertions/comments included?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, as well as any writing or grammatical errors and make a recommendation about whether significant work is necessary on writing mechanics. |  |
| **Enter your decision onto the journal’s website when you login to submit your review ONLY. The context of each decision type is detailed here.** | Please read the following guidelines for each decision type. Only enter your decision in the online system; **do not mark or highlight anything below**. Also, using the confidential note to the editor box in the online portal can be a helpful way to expound upon your decision and help the editors make better and faster decisions on next steps for the submission. **Accept** – if the manuscript is suitable for publication in its current form.**Minor revision** – if the manuscript will be appropriate for publication after minimal revisions. Examples of minor revisions of this nature include, but are not limited to: adding particular references, making an edit for grammatical correctness that is clearly and easily identified, deleting a paragraph, or the like. If you question whether a revision is minor, please email the managing editor to get clarification. **If this is a re-review**, and you believe the manuscript still requires major revisions, please do consider using that decision category. Doing so does NOT necessitate that you would be asked to re-review.**Revise and resubmit** – if the manuscript would benefit from substantial changes such as an expanded argument, significant widening of or substitutions to the evidence used to support assertions or rewriting sections of the text. Please do consider whether the extent of the revisions required suggest a rejection as described below.**Reject** – if the manuscript is not suitable for publication due to quality, impact, and/or fit concerns or if necessary revisions 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. Please consider using that comment box to expound upon your decision. |
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