Guidelines for Reviewers of Articles

for the *Journal of Islamic Ethics*

General

Reviewing is a crucial contribution you make to the quality of the Journal of Islamic Ethics (JIE) and to the progress of our field in general. We appreciate your willingness to take time away from your own research, writing and teaching to review and assist the work of others. This document aims to provide general guidelines for reviewing; we hope these will help you in the preparation of your assessment. If you have specific questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Editor.

Confidentiality

The Journal of Islamic Ethics is using a double-blinded peer review process, which means that the authors' identities are not disclosed to the reviewers and vice-versa. So please make sure to omit any clues to your identity. For these publications, even if you are aware of the author's identity (e.g., because you recognize the author's writing style), please do not refer to the author by name. Manuscripts sent for review are of course strictly confidential: they should not be distributed or used in any way without the author's consent.

Timeliness of the Reviews

Quick Feedback

Deadlines for returning reviews for JIE are taken seriously, because we know how important timely feedback is to all authors. The sooner you return your review, the sooner the authors can be informed about the fate of their submission.

Late Reviews

If one reviewer is late, this can cause significant delays in the review process as a whole. We

hope you will be able to return your review within the requested time frame. If, however, you cannot make a review deadline, please let the Editor know. In general, we would prefer that you retain manuscripts for which your review will be only slightly delayed (i.e., two weeks or less) because it takes time to find alternative reviewers. If you foresee that you will be seriously late with a review (more than 2 weeks), please notify the Editor immediately, so that a substitute reviewer can be found.

Developmental Reviews

It is important that authors learn from and benefit from the reviews. It is never enough just to say that you do or do not like a manuscript.

Be Specific

It is crucial that you tell the author what the problems are and how these problems can be addressed (where possible). This advice should be in the form of specific comments, reactions, and suggestions. The more specific you can be, the more helpful your review. It is also helpful if you number your points or paragraphs, as this will facilitate communication between the Editor and author.

Be Constructive

Even if a submission appears beyond salvation, it is still important that your review be constructive. If the problems cannot be fixed in the current study, try to suggest how the authors could improve their chances in their next research venture.

Identify Strengths

While it is important to identify critical weaknesses, it is equally important to identify major strengths. One of the most important tasks for a reviewer is to distinguish between limitations that can be fixed in a revision, and those that definitely cannot.

Language

You might be asked to review a submission written in poor language. In such cases it will be important for you to distinguish between the quality of the writing (form) and the quality of the ideas that the writing conveys (content).

Friendly Reviews

It is important that you try to be "author-friendly" in the tone of your reviews. Each author has put a lot of time and effort into their submission, so it is important to treat authors and their work with respect, even if you disagree or find fault with what they have written.

Don't Comment on Authors

Your comments should always be about the paper, not about the authors. Be tough on the issues, not on the authors.

Support

Always try to find something supportive to say; authors are more likely to appreciate what you think they did wrong if they think you appreciate what they did right. Sandwiching the negative criticism between complimentary comments makes it easier for the author to accept the criticism.

Uncertain Issues

If there are issues about which you are not sure in your review, you might temper your criticisms with an expression of your uncertainty.

The Substance of the Review

Theory

Does the paper inform or improve our understanding of existing empirical or theoretical knowledge of the fields of Islamic Ethics? Are concepts clearly explained? Is there any major flaw in the argument? Are there any factual errors in the work?

Literature Review

Does the paper cite appropriate literature and provide proper credit to existing work on the topic? Does it show awareness of and interaction with recent scholarship? If not, can you offer important references that the author has missed? Is the paper over-referenced or under-referenced?

Contribution/Novelty

Does the paper make a new and meaningful contribution to one of the fields of Islamic

Ethics, e.g. by arguing a new thesis, demonstrating a new approach, or presenting a valuable synthesis of other research?

Plagiarism

Does the work, as far as you know, to a great extent duplicate the work of others? Have you ever reviewed very similar work for other publications? How does it compare with other, especially recent, publications in the field?

Scope

In your judgment, does the contribution you are reviewing fall within the scope of the Journal of Islamic Ethics?

Structure/Coherence

Does the work cohere internally? Do all the constituent parts belong? Is there anything missing?

Short Recommendation

Please include a short recommendation that signifies the amount of work you would consider necessary for this contribution to become publishable (e.g., Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Reject).

Length and Style

Is the length of the paper commensurate with what it actually contributes? If applicable, can you say something about the writing style that could improve the contribution?

Thank You on Behalf of the Editorial Board of JIE!