

## **Clothing and Textiles Research Journal Instructions to Reviewers**

### **Submission Process**

CTRJ publishes reports of empirical, conceptual, and critical research, and welcomes submissions that use qualitative as well as quantitative approaches to intellectual inquiry. The Editor of CTRJ screens the manuscript for format, self-identification, language and content appropriateness, and manuscript length (no more than **30 double-spaced** pages including references, figures, and tables). Manuscripts not meeting the criteria are sent back to the authors to remedy. Then the manuscript is assigned to one of six Associate Editors according to the category selected by the author. After considering the content and method of the manuscript, the Associate Editor selects appropriate reviewers. To promote objectivity in the review process, CTRJ follows a double blind process in which the Associate Editor and reviewers do not know the identity of the manuscript author(s) and the author does not know the identities of the reviewers. An author can expect a response three to four months after the manuscript is successfully submitted online.

### **The Review Assignment**

Each manuscript is reviewed by at least two referees who are experts in the field, at least one being a member of the Editorial Board. An e-mail will be sent to invite participation in the review. In deciding whether to accept the assignment, consider the following questions. Have you published on the subject/method or conducted similar research so as to be competent to judge the study as conceived by the author? Are you able to return the review by the deadline? Can you undertake the review without bias or conflict of interest? If there are problems in accepting the review assignment, please decline the invitation. Otherwise, click the link to accept the assignment. The manuscript will then be available to you in your Reviewer Center in the CTRJ portal. Reviewers are encouraged to communicate directly with the Associate Editor if there are questions at any point in the review process.

### **Initial Review**

The score sheet reflects your evaluation as to acceptance, revision, or rejection of the manuscript. The following options are available:

- **Accept with editorial changes:** for the manuscript that has effectively presented a study that makes a significant contribution to the field of textiles and clothing but needs editing.
- **Minor revision:** when a portion of the manuscript needs more attention, such as providing additional documentation, expanding the discussion of the findings, including key related studies, providing additional details for the purposes of replication, or when the revision will be fairly routine, such as a reduction in overall length. This choice indicates that you, as the reviewer, believe the nature of the minor revisions is such that they can be negotiated between Author/s and Editorial Staff without further involvement of reviewers.

- Major revision: when more than one section of the manuscript needs significant attention or when extensive rewriting will be required, such as placing the study into a broader framework of scholarship, reanalyzing the data, submitting the data to additional statistical analysis, creating a context for the study, reworking data that have been overinterpreted. **This choice is only an option on first reviews.**
- Reject: for the manuscript with little or no hope of successful revision because of theoretical or methodological flaws.

### **Reviewer Comments to Editor:**

Succinct written comments to the Editor are encouraged as they will assist the Associate Editor to formulate a recommendation for the Editor. Do not repeat comments made to authors.

### **Reviewer's Comments to the Author:**

The tone of the "Comments" should reflect the philosophy that the reviewer is a colleague to the author who will be providing constructive feedback to improve the quality of the manuscript. Thus, your responsibility is to assist the author to communicate ideas central to the study by providing specific constructive criticism. No scholarly effort deserves hypercritical or rude comments, such as "The author clearly does not know what reliability is." If in your judgment a manuscript is poorly researched, poorly written, or poorly documented, write a critique that will uncover the weaknesses but also guide the author toward an acceptable revision or to an understanding of why the paper was not accepted. Take into consideration that your comments to the author will be read by the Associate Editor, Editor, and the author, as well as the other reviewer during the second review.

The reviewer is responsible for raising all substantive issues about the quality and contribution of the study in the first review. The "CTRJ Guide for Authors and Reviewers" contains questions to help you formulate your review. Comments should indicate why you are rejecting, accepting, or requesting a revision of the manuscript. Avoid general comments such as "The methodology is weak" or "Author needs to consult APA." Instead, be specific about the content problems you find and use line numbers to direct the authors to the area of the manuscript where the problems occur. Give specific references you believe the author should consider or include. If there is a problem that you cannot exactly identify, expressing your concern as something you don't understand is preferable to allowing the author to assume that the study has been communicated clearly. In the case of "fatal flaws," it is appropriate to provide the Associate Editor with documentation to support your evaluation. Suggestions for improvement are an important component of a review, but avoid a simple list that might imply that minor corrections are all that are needed, as revision does not guarantee acceptance for publication. The editors and publishing staff are responsible for routine editing and questions of format, but feel free to note recurring problems of spelling, grammar or format.

**Split Reviews:** Your decision as a reviewer may be diametrically opposed to the evaluation by the other reviewer. A manuscript that you believe is ready for publication with editing can be recommended for major revision or rejection by the other reviewer. In the case of split reviews, the Associate Editor may serve as or select a third reviewer to facilitate a recommendation.

**Procedure:** Promptly complete the online review. You may print copies of the manuscripts if you prefer to work from a hard copy, but you are asked to destroy any hard copy of the manuscript when your review is complete in order to preserve confidentiality. It should be understood that reviewers are not to share or discuss the manuscript with anyone other than the Associate Editor or Editor.

Unpublished manuscripts are the property of the author. See the 5th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2001), p. 354-355, Principle 6.26 for more information on proprietary rights.

## **Second Review**

When reviewers accept the review assignment, they are accepting responsibility for any subsequent reviews of revisions as well. For a second review, reviewers will be provided with the revised manuscript and a response-to-reviewers document that includes comments and responses for all reviewers. The recommendation options for the second review are:

- Accept with editorial changes
- Minor revision
- Rejection

If major revisions are still needed to prepare the manuscript for publication, you should recommend rejection. If minor revisions are recommended after the second review, the final revisions will be assessed by the Editor and Associate Editor only.

As you use these instructions, consider how they could be improved. Suggestions should be sent to the Editor or Associate Editors of CTRJ for transmission to the ITAA Publications Policy Committee.

Thank You!

The Editor and Associate Editors of CTRJ recognize the value of your service as a reviewer. Your effort effectively reciprocates the work of those anonymous reviewers who helped you bring your intellectual efforts to publication. Your support as a reviewer also maintains the tradition of CTRJ as an outlet for excellent scholarship.

ITAA PPC, 3/7/97

ITAA Council, 4/5/97

ITAA PPC rev, 9/99