

Hatfield Graduate Journal of Public Affairs  
Submissions Review Form

To ensure integrity during the review process, the HGJPA uses a double blind system that ensures the author and reviewer remain anonymous to each other. Only the Co-Editors will read the information on the first two pages. The third page will be returned to the author.

The following is for the confidential use of Co-Editors only:

Submission Title:	
Date:	Reviewer Code:

Based on the criteria from pg. 2, what is your recommendation for this submission?

- ◆ Accept without any revisions (requires score of 54 or higher) \_\_\_\_\_
- ◆ Accept with minor revisions (requires score of 49 or higher) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Please specify revisions for author
- ◆ Accept with substantive revisions (requires score of 46 or higher) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Please specify revisions for author
- ◆ Do not accept. Revise and resubmit for further review (paper score below 45) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Please include constructive feedback for author indicating areas where paper scored poorly
- ◆ Unacceptable. Paper is not eligible for submission (paper score below 40) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Please include constructive feedback for author indicating areas where paper scored poorly
  - Please indicate disqualifying criteria for author (i.e., low score below 40, incorrect format, irrelevant subject matter, plagiarism, inappropriate language/content, etc.)

*Confidential* comments for the Co-Editors only:

Please evaluate the submission based on the following criteria:

---

- Importance of the subject: 1   2   3   4
- Issue examined is a prominent concern of public affairs
- Topic of this paper is timely
- Topic of this paper is of interest to the readers of this journal
- Originality of the approach: 1   2   3   4
- Paper presents original ideas or methods
- Policy recommendations are well targeted/useful—if applicable  
(if not applicable, choose 4 for scoring)
- Soundness of the scholarship: 1   2   3   4
- Paper is based on rigorous academic or professional standards
- Review of literature/issue is exhaustive and relevant
- Paper successfully applies relevant theoretical concepts
- Clarity of the organization: 1   2   3   4
- Paper structure is well organized
- Ideas/recommendations are clearly articulated
- Paper is well written with proper conventions:  
Includes: Sentence structure, word choice, free of errors,  
proper format, accurate citations
- Strength of the argument: 1   2   3   4
- Selected research methodology is appropriate
- Conclusion is convincing
- Results are not overstated or overgeneralized

SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_/56

## Comments for the Author:

---

Thank you for your submission, after careful review the editorial board has made the following decision:

- ◆ Accept without any revisions (requires score of 54 or higher)
  - ◆ Accept with minor revisions (requires score of 49 or higher)
  - ◆ Accept with substantive revisions (requires score of 46 or higher)
  - ◆ Do not accept. Revise and resubmit for further review (paper score below 45)
  - ◆ Unacceptable. Paper is not eligible for submission (paper score below 40)
- 

Score \_\_\_\_/56

General Comments, Strengths & Constructive Criticisms:

Minor Revisions:

Substantive Revisions (Please include constructive feedback for author indicating areas where paper scored poorly):

Revise and Resubmit (Please include constructive feedback for author indicating areas where paper scored poorly):

Unacceptable:

Please indicate disqualifying criteria for author (i.e., low score below 40, incorrect format, irrelevant subject matter, plagiarism, inappropriate language/content, etc.)