

Reviewer Guidelines

Reviewers have an important role in ensuring the integrity of a scientific journal. As an editorial in *The American Naturalist* aptly explained:

The system works primarily because of the reciprocal altruism inherent in its operation. Scientists are willing to review papers because they know they will benefit in the future from similar contributions by others. As with any game involving altruists, cheaters are unwanted but unavoidable. . . . However, the vast majority of individuals feel that they have a responsibility to contribute their expertise as a reviewer whenever their schedule allows, and they take great pride in this work. (McPeck et al., p. E156).

For more on the role and responsibility of reviewers, see the full editorial at www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/598847.

The review process for *Laboratory Phonology* follows the procedure below.

Reviewer selection

The Associate Editor to whom a manuscript has been assigned will contact potential reviewers based on their expertise in a specific area. Members of the Association for Laboratory Phonology who would like to review can indicate their areas of expertise in their member profiles. Reviewers who are not members of the Association must create a reviewer profile in order to download the submitted manuscript and upload their review.

Timeline

In general, reviews are due three weeks from the date the manuscript is received. Timely reviews are essential in maintaining the publication schedule of the journal. If you realize that you will not be able to make a review deadline, please let the Associate Editor know as soon as possible.

Blind review

Laboratory Phonology utilizes a double-blind review process. Reviewers do not know the identities of authors, and authors do not know the identities of reviewers. The editors will ensure that all personal information is removed from the properties of electronic files before those files are sent to reviewers and authors.

Ethical duties

- Manuscripts under review are confidential and must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.
- Reviews should be conducted objectively, and opinions should be supported with logical arguments.
- Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.
- Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Reviewers should notify the editor of any substantial similarity or overlap between the submitted manuscript and other published papers.
- Reviewers may not use unpublished materials from a submitted manuscript without the written consent of the author.
- Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from relationships or connections with any of the authors or institutions connected to the papers.

Reviewers' reports

Reviewers are asked to evaluate whether the paper

- Addresses topics of relevance to Laboratory Phonology
- Is original
- Is methodologically sound
- Follows appropriate ethical guidelines
- Presents results clearly
- Supports its conclusions with relevant data
- Correctly references previous relevant work

Reviewers are not responsible for spelling and grammar correction, but may suggest corrections, if they so wish.

Reviewers should upload their reviews as a .doc or .pdf file.

Final report

After the Associate Editor has received all reviews, he or she will make a final decision on the manuscript. The Associate Editor will send a report to the corresponding author, which includes the text of the reviews and a summary of the decision. Reviewers will receive a copy of this report.

In some cases, the Associate Editor might ask the author to resubmit a revised version of the paper. Often, the original reviewers will be asked to ensure that the author made all necessary changes in the revision. This second review will be uploaded to the website. After a final accept or reject decision is made on the paper, the reviewers will be notified of the decision.