

**From Researcher to Author:
Converting Research into Publication**

The IEL Collective Writing and Publications Workshop

**16 – 17 April 2024
Warwick Law School, University of Warwick**

GUIDANCE FOR PRESENTATIONS & PEER REVIEW

PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL DOCUMENTS ARE CIRCULATED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS WORKSHOP ONLY. YOU MUST NOT SHARE OR CIRCULATE THE DOCUMENTS BEYOND THE GROUP THAT IT HAS BEEN CIRCULATED IN. YOU MUST NOT CITE OR USE ANY PART OF THE DOCUMENTS – PAPERS, CHAPTERS OR PROPOSALS – IN ANY FORM WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE AUTHOR.

MONOGRAPHS TRACK

Documents

Each participant has submitted the following documents:

1. A book proposal or one-page pitch.
2. A substantive chapter.

Authors' Presentations

You have **five minutes** each to present your proposal.

1. Describe the overall argument in your book proposal, the genre it speaks to and the contribution it will make to the existing scholarship.
2. Describe how your submitted chapter fits into the schema of the book.
3. Briefly identify areas of difficulty where feedback might be most helpful in developing the proposal and the arguments in the book.

Peer Feedback

You have **ten minutes** to provide feedback on the proposal and chapter assigned to you.

Consider the book proposal and the chapter together as the chapter will give you a flavour of the book's substance. You are not expected to provide detailed feedback on the chapter but to examine it in the context of the book proposal.

The following questions may be helpful in framing your peer review and feedback:

1. Contribution to the discipline

- Does this book make a significant contribution to the discipline at this time?
- Is there a need for a book on the subject at the proposed level?
- Do you think that there would be a clear readership for this book? Has the author adequately explained the target audience for the book?
- Has the author situated this book within the context of its competitors, and have they explained how their book differs?
- Are you aware of any other major competitors for this book, either published or in preparation, which have not been mentioned in the proposal?
- Would you consider using this book for a class you are teaching, or might you recommend it to your graduate students?
- Is this subject area expanding, static or contracting?
- Is the useful life of the book likely to be 3, 5 or 10 years?

2. Academic rigour and accuracy

- Is the methodology or argument proposed for the book academically sound and/or convincing? Is it original?
- Are the appropriate related topics and/or research literature mentioned in the book proposal?
- Are there any obvious gaps in the coverage of the book?
- Is the information (e.g. data, quotations, references, tables and figures) in the proposal and/or sample chapters accurate and correct?

3. Style and structure

- Is the proposed structure of the book (and where available, the table of contents) clear and well-organised?
- Is there any extraneous material in the proposed structure of the book that you feel could be omitted?
- Can the material be covered in the proposed length?
- Is the language in the proposal clear and accurate?
- Is the language in any sample chapters clear and accurate?

JOURNAL ARTICLES TRACK

Documents

Each participant has submitted the following documents:

1. Abstract and table of contents and the target journal.
2. The substantive paper.

Authors' Presentations

You have **five minutes** each to present your proposal.

1. Describe the overall argument in your paper, e.g, the genre and the intervention/ contribution it will make to the existing scholarship.
2. Identify your target publication and explain why you think your paper fits in this publication.
3. Briefly identify areas of difficulty where feedback might be most helpful in developing the paper.

You have **ten minutes** to provide feedback on the proposal and chapter assigned to you.

The following questions may be helpful in framing your peer review and feedback:

1. The article's contribution to the discipline

- Does the article make a contribution to the discipline?
- How significant is that contribution?
- Do the authors adequately explain the importance of the article in the discipline?
- Is the article a good fit for the journal in question? Importance to select an appropriate journal.

2. Academic rigour and accuracy

- Is the methodology or argument used in the article sound?
- Does the article make a reasonable interpretation of the data or sources?
- Is there sufficient evidence to substantiate the article's claims?
- Are the appropriate references cited, and are there any other references that you would recommend as essential to the article?
- Are those references cited assessed fairly by the author?
- Is the information (e.g. data, quotations, references, tables and figures) in the article accurate and correct?

3. Style and structure

- Is the structure of the article clear and well organised?

- Does the author introduce and contextualise the aims of the article effectively?
- Does the author summarise the conclusions of the article effectively?
- Is the language in the article clear and correct?
- Does the abstract accurately present the article's aims, argument and conclusions?

You should think about the different outcomes for an article after peer review and provide indicative feedback.

Outcomes:

Accept without revision: Very rarely, an article will be accepted for publication without any revisions requested.

Minor revisions needed: The article is mostly sound, but with some small changes required to the argument, interpretation of the results, or references.

Minor revisions might include:

- A small amount of editing to the language, to improve how the article's findings or argument are communicated
- Small additional experiments to complement the main body of the article
- Including a small number of new citations or mentioning additional topics
- Tweaking the interpretation of the results or evidence
- You should give a detailed assessment of those minor revisions you believe to be essential to the quality of the article.
- Suggestions for other, but non-essential, improvements to the article are also welcomed, but you should clearly differentiate these in your review from those which you consider to be essential. This will allow both editor and author(s) to prioritise your recommendations effectively.

Major revisions needed: The principle of the article is sound, but it will be necessary for large changes to be made in order to prepare it for publication. Situations in which major revisions

Outcomes for Journals

Accept without revision: Very rarely, an article will be accepted for publication without any revisions requested.

Minor revisions needed: The article is mostly sound, but with some small changes required to the argument, interpretation of the results, or references. Minor revisions might include:

- A small amount of editing to the language, to improve how the article's findings or argument are communicated
- Small additional experiments to complement the main body of the article
- Including a small number of new citations or mentioning additional topics
- Tweaking the interpretation of the results or evidence
- You should give a detailed assessment of those minor revisions you believe to be essential to the quality of the article.

- Suggestions for other, but non-essential, improvements to the article are also welcomed, but you should clearly differentiate these in your review from those which you consider to be essential. This will allow both editor and author(s) to prioritise your recommendations effectively.

Major revisions needed: The principle of the article is sound, but it will be necessary for large changes to be made in order to prepare it for publication. Situations in which major revisions may be required:

- Substantial rewriting is required because key elements are missing from the paper or not described in adequate detail.
- Reviewers have highlighted problems with analysis, factual or legal inaccuracies or incomplete analysis.
- There are concerns with academic practice or ethics. This may require further investigation or revision.
- The arguments are not coherent due to language competency.

Rejection:

- If the article has major structural issues that need to be rectified by significantly reorganizing the text.
- If the argument needs to take into account a whole new topic.
- If existing analysis is flawed and needs to be re-worked.
- There are serious concerns with academic integrity.

