

Peer Review Guidelines

The following peer review guidelines are intended to help Reviewers complete thorough evaluations of their assigned manuscripts. The role of the Reviewer is to provide an expert perspective that helps the editorial team determine the fitness, relevance, and significance of the manuscript for readers of *Urban Education*.

Before a manuscript is sent out for peer-review, it must pass an internal review process. This process is spearheaded by the Editor-in-Chief and is designed to expedite decisions on manuscripts that are outside of the scope of the Journal and are unlikely to be published. No Reviewer should receive a manuscript that does not have an explicit focus on urban education. The Editor will make all attempts to match the topic of the article with the specialty of the Reviewer. If you receive a manuscript that is outside of your specialty, please contact the Editor so that the manuscript can be reassigned.

For **Empirical Articles**, Reviewers are asked to address the following:

Significance/Relevance to Urban Education

- Is the topic timely and relevant to the field of urban education? Why or why not?
- Does the topic/manuscript make a significant contribution to the field? Why or why not?

Introduction

- Does the introduction provide a clear framing of the article?
- Does the article clearly articulate its unique contribution to the field? Why or why not?
- Are the research questions and major issues introduced?
- Is there an explicit thesis that introduces readers to the topic?

Literature Review

- Is the literature review synthesized and critiqued? Why or why not?
- Is the major research literature reviewed? Why or why not?
- Is the literature review current and logical? Why or why not?
- Is the literature review rigorous? Has the author left out important citations?

Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

- Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic explored? Why or why not?
- How well developed is the theoretical framework?

- Is the theoretical framework used as an analytic tool throughout the article? Why or why not?
- Are useful tenets and constructs used throughout the manuscript?
- Is the conceptual framework applied appropriately?

Methods (if empirical)

- Is the manuscript methodologically sound? Why or why not?
- Are all relevant methods for data collection included and clearly described? Why or why not?
- Is the methodology grounded in the literature?

Findings (if empirical)

- Are the findings grounded in the data collected? Why or why not?
- Do the findings match the research questions?
- Are the findings compelling and contributory to the field?

Conclusions and Implications

- Does the manuscript draw conclusions that are supported by the results of its research, established literature, and conceptual framework?
- Are explicit implications drawn for readers of *Urban Education* related to theory, research, practice, and/or policy?

Figures and Tables (if applicable)

- Are the figures and tables used easy to read and are they accurately representative?

These guidelines are only a framework that Reviewers may build from. Reviewers are strongly encouraged to elaborate on any of the included questions or any other concerns that they may have about the manuscript. Your comments are not only valuable to the Editor, but also to the Author as they progress through the publication process.

Reviews should be at least one-page and bullet-pointed for clarity. Please note: reviewers should not include their publication recommendations (accept, accept with revision, revise and resubmit, or reject) in the body of their message to the author. Instead, please make your recommendation when prompted in the SAGE Tracks system.