



Manuscript Review Areas	Ready to send to review	Send to review or revise and resubmit prior to sending to reviewers with suggestions/recommendations	May result in desk reject if manuscript is also problematic in other areas, otherwise, revise and resubmit prior to sending to reviewers	Any single area deficiency to result in desk reject of manuscript
	4	3	2	1
Style	Conforms to APA	Has APA issues that can be corrected in copyedit (minor concerns in 1-2 areas, APA references, citations, quotes, headings, etc.)	Has APA issues that require reworking by author in multiple areas (references, citations, quotes, headings, etc.)	Does not conform to APA
Writing	Clear, concise, voice of author evident	Needs some tightening of language/sentences - doesn't interfere with readability of manuscript	Has several awkward and/or unclear areas - at times readability of manuscript is problematic	Writing issues interfered with readability of the manuscript
Purpose of Manuscript/Study	Clear, understandable; grounded in the literature	Could use refinement	Not clearly stated; but could be clear if reworded	Not clear, not stated, or not evident from the Literature Review
Abstract	Abstract is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ concise</li> <li>▪ clarifies the purpose of the manuscript</li> </ul>	Abstract is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ too long</li> <li>▪ explains the purpose of the study but includes unnecessary information</li> </ul>	Abstract is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ concise</li> <li>▪ does not explain the purpose of the abstract and has elements that are not necessary</li> </ul>	There is no abstract.
Research Questions	Relate to purpose-guide the study	Relate to Purpose, but could use a bit of streamlining	Not clearly related to the purpose; perhaps unfocused or even too many	Research questions not clear or stated

Manuscript Review Areas	Ready to send to review	Send to review or revise and resubmit prior to sending to reviewers with suggestions/recommendations	May result in desk reject if manuscript is also problematic in other areas, otherwise, revise and resubmit prior to sending to reviewers	Any single area deficiency to result in desk reject of manuscript
	4	3	2	1
<b>Methodology</b>	Theoretically grounded; methods appropriate to approach to inquiry and scholars for methods/ methodology are cited. Includes sample, data, analysis tools, validity/ trustworthiness, and limitations	Mostly clear, could use some language clarity, but not enough to interfere with reader understanding. Includes most of these: sample, data collection, analysis tools, validity/ trustworthiness, and limitations	Doesn't ground methods in approach to inquiry. Includes only a few of these: sample, data collection, analysis tools, validity/ trustworthiness, and limitations	Seems to demonstrate a lack of understanding of methodology and methods
<b>Findings</b>	Inform the purpose responds to research questions being pursued	Has some interesting findings that respond to the research questions and purpose	Findings really need to be reworked for relationship to purpose and research questions	Findings aren't linked back to research questions and purpose
<b>Discussion/ Implications</b>	Relates Findings to topic and offers implications for practice, policy, & future research for further work on topic	Provides some implications for either practice, policy, or future research, but could have a deeper analysis	Somewhat superficial; does not go into much depth or connect implications to topic	Limited discussion, if any, regarding the work and its implications for future work
<b>Implications for Academic Advising/ Advisors</b>	Provides creative guidance as to how this work can be applied to advising and/or advisors	Offers some implications based on the findings, but could use additional refinement	Offers limited guidance, but not in an original or creative way	Doesn't speak to the field at all
<b>Overall Contribution to the Field and Student Success</b>	Adds value to what is already known/fills a gap; important to include in what we know; advances the field of academic advising	Adds value to what is already known/fills a gap; important to include in what we know; advances the field of academic advising	Not groundbreaking, but not irrelevant	Does not add to literature or advance the field (So what, research/ scholarship)
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A concise review of purpose and implications for academic advising</li> <li>This "so what" is repeated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too long</li> <li>Reviews the purpose, implications, and "so what" but includes unnecessary information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concise</li> <li>Is missing a review of purpose, implications, and/ or so what</li> </ul>	No conclusion