

QUAIL VIII: Proceedings of the Eighth National Quail Symposium
Manuscript Reviewer Guidelines
July 7, 2016
(Adapted from Journal of the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies)

General Guidelines

The review will uphold comparable standards and rigor in study design, execution, analysis, and interpretation that are expected from any peer-reviewed publication. There is less concern, however, about the novelty or scope of inference, but publication in QUAIL VIII: Proceedings of the Eighth National Quail Symposium (Quail 8) is expected to make a meaningful contribution to quail conservation.

Reviewers are requested to provide specific, in-depth evaluations of manuscripts submitted by authors. Specific recommendations are necessary to inform both the authors and editors of manuscript suitability for publication in Quail 8, and changes required prior to publication. Reviews written in a constructive tone will have the greatest benefit for both authors and Quail 8.

The primary contribution of reviewers is disciplinary evaluation of the technical content of manuscripts. Evaluation of English presentation and organization is appreciated, but is of secondary concern. Changes that will ensure technical accuracy and increase the ability of readers to comprehend the technical information are suggested.

Clearly inform the Associate Editor in writing of all manuscript limitations and corresponding recommendations. The Quail 8 Associate Editor will use input from two reviewers to develop a recommendation that is provided to the Quail 8 Editors. Please treat all manuscripts and associated correspondence as confidential.

Please provide your reviews in a list format. Do not use track changes in WORD or ADOBE.

Critical Manuscript Components

Reviewers are encouraged to focus on the following manuscript components:

- Does the manuscript follow the guidelines outlined in the [Author Guidelines--Quail VIII: Proceedings of the Eighth National Quail Symposium](#)?
- Are the experimental design and corresponding statistical analysis appropriate and do they support the conclusions and inferences drawn?
- Are the data effectively interpreted within the existing knowledge on this topic, including citation of current, relevant literature?

- Is the length of the manuscript appropriate for the content? Are the figures and table appropriate and necessary?

Reviewer Recommendations

Reviewers can recommend one of the following 4 options.

- **Accept in current form**
Recommend "accept in current form" only when no revisions of any kind are required. Manuscripts rarely receive this recommendation during the initial review. Minor revisions are commonly required through the copy editing process.
- **Accept with minor revisions**
Recommend "accept with minor revisions and further Associate Editor review" when a manuscript clearly contributes to quail conservation, but requires minor corrections. These are often editorial in nature and seldom involve modification of data analysis or interpretation. Revised manuscripts with this recommendation are handled by the Editor and Associate Editor without additional reviewer input.
- **Accept with major revisions**
Recommend "accept with major revisions and further review" when a manuscript has the potential to contribute to quail conservation, but requires major modification. Major modification may result from poor English presentation, ineffective manuscript organization, inappropriate or questionable data analysis, and conclusions that are inconsistent with the data. Revised manuscripts with this recommendation are often returned to the initial reviewers for further evaluation.
- **Reject**
Recommend "reject" if a manuscript does not add to the knowledge base of quail conservation. Inappropriate subject matter, marginal data, insufficient experimental design, and minimal concept development may result in this recommendation. Be sure to provide a strong rationale for your decision, but it is not necessary to include recommendations for revising the manuscript. The authors will receive the reviewers' comments and rationale, as well as the Associate Editor recommendation.

Reviewer Rating

Reviewers are asked to give the manuscript a rating out of 100 based on perceived contribution to quail conservation.

Reviewer Conflict of Interest

Please inform the Associate Editor of a potential conflict of interest if one or more of the following conditions exists:

- Familiarity with the author(s), laboratory, or institution may interfere with your ability to provide an objective assessment.
- Involvement in the work presented in the manuscript or informal manuscript review prior to submission.
- Strong professional opinions about the topic may interfere with your ability to provide an objective assessment.
- Your subject matter expertise is only marginally related to the topic described in the manuscript.

The Quail & Editors greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in the review process. Your contribution ensures the continued success of the National Quail Symposia Series and advances quail conservation.

Manuscript No:

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer:

Manuscript Recommendation:
Manuscript Rating (max 100):
Comments to Associate Editor:

Comments to Author: