

ROCKY MOUNTAIN FUR TRADE JOURNAL

Peer Review Guidelines and Questionnaire

The primary purpose of your peer review is to assist the Editor and Editorial Board of the *Rocky Mountain Fur Trade Journal* in evaluating and deciding whether to publish this article. Your review should also instruct the author(s) on ways to strengthen the paper. As much as possible, a negative review should describe weaknesses in the article so that, if rejected, the author(s) understand the basis for such a decision and, in broad terms, what needs to be done to improve the article for future publication. Reviewers should not feel obliged to provide detailed, constructive advice to authors of papers that do not meet the criteria of the *Journal*. If a reviewer believes that an article would not be suitable for publication, their report should be as brief as is consistent with enabling the editors, as well as the author(s) to understand the reason for that opinion.

Peer reviewers are asked to comment on the following:

- Accuracy – All facts stated in the paper should be supported by reference to the source. The reviewer should note any suspected or known factual errors.
- General or Vague Statements – General statements should not be used unless defended with facts. For example, statements that start “A trapper once said....” or “Historians believe....” are not statements of fact unless supported by references. If the author does not define who the “trapper” or “historians” are, then the statements are not likely to support their theory.
- Experiments – In cases where experiments are conducted with support of historical research, procedures should be clearly defined in such a way that they could be duplicated. Procedures should also be constructed to minimize errors and false results.
- Original Work – The reviewer should indicate if the work appears original. If work is derived from previous work, that should be stated. Reviewer should point out similar work that was not referenced.
- Completeness – The author should make a rigorous and thorough defense of theories and subjects. This means complete presentation of all relevant information. Reviewer should suggest other relevant information or sources that were not used.

Peer reviewers do not necessarily have to agree with theories and conclusions of a paper, but should make sure the paper is accurate and thorough. Difference of opinions given the same set of facts is a healthy debate that the *Journal* wants to encourage.

Please use the following questions as an outline for your written review:

1. What does the article set out to explain or describe? What are the purposes, main arguments, and conclusions of the article? Are these primary concepts clearly defined?
2. Are the primary claims of the article significant? If so, briefly explain why.
3. Is the article a contribution to the field? Why? What new concepts, data, etc., are presented?
4. Are these new concepts convincing? If not, what further evidence is needed?

ROCKY MOUNTAIN FUR TRADE JOURNAL

5. Is the scholarship sound? Are the claims appropriately discussed in the context of previous works, and well cited? Would reference to other sources be pertinent and contribute to the paper?
6. Would further experiments or work improve the paper, and, if so, how difficult or time-consuming would this be?
7. Are there comparable works on this topic? If so, please identify them. Does the article overlap with them? If so, how? If published, would the article compete with or complement these works? If so, why?
8. Whom would you identify as the primary and (if any) secondary audience(s) for this article?
9. Is the article well written?
10. If the article is unacceptable, is it sufficiently promising to encourage the author(s) to resubmit? If the article is unacceptable but promising, what specific work not already identified in this review is needed to make it acceptable?
11. Remarks. (We welcome your suggestions for strengthening the article. Where possible, please be specific.)

My final reaction is to ☐ support ☐ oppose publication of this article.

Please complete this questionnaire as a word document and return it to the editor of the *Rocky Mountain Fur Trade Journal* at editor@mmmuseum.com. Please include your name and the article title in all correspondence.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN FUR TRADE JOURNAL POLICY ON REVIEWERS' REPORTS

1. The *Rocky Mountain Fur Trade Journal* will remove all authors' names before articles are submitted to peer reviewers to ensure a blind review process.
2. The names of reviewers will not be revealed to authors by the *Rocky Mountain Fur Trade Journal* unless permission is received from the reviewer beforehand.
3. Authors will receive a summary of all peer reviews.
4. If you have recommended publication and if the *Rocky Mountain Fur Trade Journal* publishes the article, we may wish to quote from your report in promoting the *Journal*. Space limitations may require that the quotation be abbreviated, but the editing would not alter your intended meaning. We may publish such edited quotations in advertisements or in other promotions unless **permission is denied** by a check in the following box: ☐