



Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

- Helpful tip: [Download a copy of the review questions](#) to use and fill out while you read the article. This makes it easy to transfer your work into the Editorial Manager review fields.

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Please remember that a copy of your review goes to the author. Your comments are meant to be constructive. Positive as well as negative comments can be important and appropriate, if delivered properly. These should help the authors realize that any suggestions are not merely meant as criticisms, but rather are intended to improve the quality of the article so that the end result is a professional publication. Blatantly insulting or mean-spirited comments cannot be passed on to authors. Framing comments in a constructive and professional manner will improve the author's ability to absorb them and increase our chances of receiving a publishable revision.

Please do not use your name while entering your comments into Editorial Manager. If you decide to mark up a Word document or PDF of the manuscript, please try to remove your name from the comments. If you are not able to do this, please let your editor know so we can use the system's tools to keep your anonymity.

INTRODUCTION

JAIC welcomes articles on subjects of interest to professional conservators and the conservation field. These articles may treat their subjects generally or in detail; they may include practical, scientific, theoretical, or historical topics. To ensure the quality of the journal's articles, and to assist the authors in the publishing process, we want to provide constructive criticism of the submissions.

PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

1. *The primary purpose is to determine whether the article constitutes a contribution to the literature of conservation or related fields.* Consider the paper from the point of view of both a specialist and a generalist. The paper should have some meaning for a reader who is not a specialist in the topic being discussed. Be aware that authors are instructed to submit original material that has not been published previously (except in the AIC *Preprints*, specialty group preprints or postprints, or conference postprints without widespread circulation) and that the article should not have been submitted to another journal.
2. *Clarity is important.* You should judge whether the article is clearly organized and well presented. If not, recommend changes. Detailed copyediting, if needed, should be suggested to the author.
3. *Specific points should be raised when necessary.* You should ask questions concerning a conservation treatment. You should also question a technical or scientific procedure if something is omitted, misleading, or unclear. Judge whether a treatment is appropriate, well done, and ethical. Errors of all kinds should be pointed out. Key statements of fact, unless well known, should be supported by literature references and/or experimental evidence. Keep in mind that many times there are multiple approaches that might be taken to designing a scientific experiment or a conservation treatment. Even if you might have designed the project differently, changes should only be recommended if there are actual errors or clearly inappropriate steps taken in the project.

4. *Correct for style and errors in scientific terminology.* The *Journal* does **not** publish footnotes and entertains limited endnotes. If you review a paper with footnotes, instruct the author to study the *JAIC* guidelines regarding the *Journal's* policy and recommend that they incorporate that information into the text. Similarly, *JAIC* guidelines call for the use of metric rather than English measurements. You may point this out to the author if you notice that English measurements were used. Articles must conform to the *Journal* style before they are considered for final publication. If you find errors in specialized conservation or scientific terminology, please indicate them.
5. *Being concise is key.* Please review whether there are too many figures or tables, or information than should be summarized rather than included. While there is no page limit, the article should be clear and focused on the chosen topic.

MECHANICS OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

Before you begin the review, you may want to see the questions you'll be asked. Download a usable copy of the questions at <https://www.culturalheritage.org/docs/default-source/resources/administration/guidelines/jaic-review-questions-2016.docx>.

1. Accept the invitation via email by clicking "I can review." You will be sent an email containing a link to the paper you are to review, or you can find it in your Editorial Manager account under Pending Assignments.
2. Download a copy of the paper to review. You may add comments to the pdf using Adobe Acrobat or print a copy to write comments on directly – you will need to scan your comments in this case. You may also provide line edits by indicating the passage in a new Word document. These files may be uploaded when you submit your review.
3. All reviews must be submitted via the *JAIC* online portal Editorial Manager at <http://jac.edmgr.com>. Click on your assigned article, then select Action Links > Submit Recommendation.
4. At the top of the page, indicate your final recommendation (via dropdown menu):

Accept As-Is, with No Further Edits: The paper is perfect as submitted and is ready for publication with minor proofreading.

Accept but Return for Minor Revisions: The paper is almost ready for publication, requiring only simple revisions that could be accomplished within one month.

Accept but with Major Revisions: More extensive revisions are required (such as rethinking interpretations of the data, finding and incorporating missed references into the narrative, rethinking the structure and presentation of data tables, adding illustrations, etc.). This category of acceptance may require two to three months for revisions to be completed.

Reject but May Resubmit: The topic and basic approach of the treatment or experiments are appropriate to *JAIC*, but some of the work needs to be redone, or additional experiments need to be incorporated. Note that "Reject may resubmit" does NOT mean that the paper is unsuitable for *JAIC*, nor is it a negative response. It simply means that the requested revisions will probably require more than three months to complete. If you choose this option, emphasize in your comments that the author is, in fact, encouraged to resubmit the article and that the recommendation is not a negative one, but rather one which will allow more time for revisions.

Reject – Manuscript is Unsuitable: The paper is unsuitable for *JAIC*. If you have ideas for a more appropriate venue, please feel free to mention them for the author’s benefit.

Reject – Manuscript is Unsound: The paper is not ready for publication anywhere. The paper has incorrect or inconclusive research, makes no contribution to the literature, and would not be useable in its current form.

5. Add your comments and notes. Please type your comments directly into the query boxes or upload a saved file into the comments box at the end. You can write comments that will be sent anonymously to the author in the Comments to the Author field; you can also direct comments to the editors using the Comments to the Editor field. The authors will not see the comments to the editor. Your anonymous review notes and comments will be included in the decision letter sent by the *Journal* editor-in-chief.
6. Please remember that this is a confidential process. Do not discuss this paper with colleagues, except confidentially if you need some advice in preparing your review.
7. Please contact JAIC’s Managing Editor Bonnie Naugle at bnaugle@culturalheritage.org regarding any questions or problems.
8. If you find that you cannot make the deadline, inform the AIC office immediately to discuss a new due date. Our timetable is tight because we prefer to inform our contributors of the status of their papers within three months – it is a courtesy so they have time to submit to another journal if their article is not a good fit, or so they can budget time for revisions.
9. Lastly, your reviews are transmitted to the assigned associate editor, who makes a recommendation based on your comments and another reviewer’s comments. That recommendation is considered by the editor-in-chief, who then must make a decision and inform the author.

—Revised May 2022