

Bridges: Collaborative Peer Review Guide

* Originally prepared by Timothy Monreal, April 2019

**This is a live document meaning ideas and suggestion are encouraged and expected. Please leave a comment with any thoughts, edits, or suggestions.

***Much of this process is inspired by *Hybrid Pedagogy's* peer review process. Please [read](#) this article for more information.

General Beliefs and Principles for Bridges' Open Peer Review Process

1. Every piece is a potentiality.
2. Rather than general critique, think with a **“how can we make this publishable?”** and **“how to expand our criticality with each other?”** orientation.
3. If not sure, ask!
4. Peer review is conversations and dialogues. “Voices are welcomed; all perspectives are necessary. A journal run by educators is — or should necessarily be — a classroom” ([Morris, 2013](#)).
5. We aim to build healthier academic communities by being transparent about the review process to work toward publications.
6. Our scholarship, writing, and thinking should not further marginalize, or contribute to, the marginalization of marginalized groups/people. Rather, this scholarship and thinking and writing process aim to connect marginalized writers and thinkers together in a healthy and critical academic community.
7. Open and collaborative does not mean the work and review is any less rigorous. In contrast, it brings criticality, empathy, and deep understanding toward the topic of the writers so that all can learn and thrive with each other.
8. Scholarship comes in many shapes and forms. In this community, constructiveness is a core value to bring different shapes and forms of scholarship together.
9. If you agree to review, commit yourself to the review. The pieces are short in length, but may take extended rounds of iterative dialogues. Come with an open heart and patience to build a community together.

Suggested Process for Review

1. The editor will put the reviewer(s) and the author(s) in contact with each other.
 - a. As part of this communication, the editor will make sure the author(s) add the reviewer(s) to their google document.

- i. We suggest the reviewers are added as comment only, however ultimately this is the decision of the manuscript (authors)
 - b. The point of contact should be restricted to the google document only. Any further information related to the phone number, mailing address and other personal identities are not strongly encouraged to share.
 2. The author(s) will communicate any special considerations the reviewer(s) should be aware of.
 - a. Particularly, it may be helpful for the author(s) to briefly describe
 - i. Voice/Tone
 - ii. Purpose
 - iii. Argument
 - iv. Audience
 3. With the following information in hand, (re)read the piece and use the comments feature to begin dialogue.
 4. You may also wish to leave general questions, concerns, or ideas in the form of narrative at the end of the submission. Any resources for the author(s) to read is welcomed and encouraged.
 5. When you and the author(s) feel as if the piece is ready for final review please reach out to the editor (tmonreal@email.sc.edu)
 - a. Please point out any glaring grammatical issues as part of a final revision
 - b. Please acknowledge at the final page that both the reviewer(s) and the author(s) agree that the piece is ready to publish.

Style Guide

1. APA citations and references (6th Edition)
2. Please hyperlink to any relevant information or citations. This can be done in two ways
 - a. By hyperlinking the in-text citation OR
 - b. By hyperlinking the sentence verb