



Journal of the NATIVE AMERICAN and
INDIGENOUS STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Peer Review Guidelines for Manuscripts

Reviewers can opt to use the attached form or a format of their choosing. Either way, detailed, substantial reports are the most helpful to our review process (e.g. rather than yes or no answers). The confidentiality and anonymity of your review will be protected unless you choose to reveal your identity to the author(s). We ask that you **return your review within 4 weeks**; if you need a time extension please contact the managing editor at journal@naisa.org.

Since the journal's inception, *NAIS* editors have endeavored to foster generous, constructive, and rigorous peer review, which the *NAIS* community of reviewers provides to an impressive degree. The editors may offer a round of developmental review to authors when a submitted manuscript shows promise but is not ready for peer review. We highly value the time and effort our peer reviewers invest in providing constructive, supportive reviews and believe the developmental review step can facilitate a manuscript's timely progress through peer review.

In 2021 Jani Wilson, Māori member of the *NAIS* Editorial Board, articulated a concise suite of values in te reo (Māori language) and English, which we feel captures the spirit of *NAIS* peer review (reproduced here with her permission):

1. Acknowledge the work and the authors' courage - kia māia, be brave;
2. Underline the work's strengths - kia kaha, be strong;
3. Highlight "developable" elements (the weaknesses) - haere tonu, keep going;
4. Guide a way forward - āwhinahia, assistance; and
5. Commend and wish the author(s) the best - whakamanawatia, honour.

Please respond to the following prompts in offering your professional evaluation to the editors and in making suggestions to the author(s) that may improve the manuscript. We ask that you not include your recommendations for publication in comments to the author but use the area at the end of the form to direct those comments to the editors.



Journal of the NATIVE AMERICAN and
INDIGENOUS STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Manuscript Review Form

1. Overall assessment of the manuscript. Can you easily identify the thesis?
2. In what ways does the manuscript specifically address Indigenous studies scholarship?
3. Is the subject broadly conceived? Is it accessible to non-specialists?
4. Does the manuscript make a significant intervention or contribution to the scholarship? Does it move beyond a synthesis or review of the secondary literature? Are there significant errors, omissions, or inaccuracies? Does the manuscript require additional research?
5. Evaluation of sources and methods: Is the manuscript methodologically sound? Does the manuscript use appropriate sources for the claims and arguments it makes? Does the manuscript engage with relevant scholarship? Do the sources support the argument?
6. Quality of the writing: Is the title engaging and appropriate? Does the abstract accurately and concisely describe the manuscript? Are the introduction, thesis statement, and conclusion clear and in accord with one another? Is the style readable? Is the manuscript well organized and clearly argued? Does the manuscript contain any problematic language?
7. Is the manuscript / author(s) supportive of or relevant to the lifeways and sovereignty of Indigenous communities?
8. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions that might be helpful to the author(s). You may, if you wish, use Track Changes on the manuscript – the managing editor will make sure your identity is masked in correspondence with the author(s).

9. Are the illustrations (e.g. charts, tables, or maps) integral to the success and clarity of the manuscript? Are the figures or illustrations well integrated into the narrative of the manuscript? Are there any additional illustrations that would improve the success and clarity of the manuscript?

Recommendations to the editors:

- **Accept (ACC):** Only minor copy-editing is required.
- **Accept with Minor Revisions (AMR):** The manuscript clearly merits publication in *NAIS* but requires specific revisions.
- **Revise Toward Acceptance (RTA):** The manuscript has great promise but requires some significant revision.
- **Revise and Resubmit (RR):** The manuscript is not acceptable in its current form but has value and should be returned to the author(s) for substantial revision.
- **Decline with Encouragement (DWE):** The manuscript has potential but requires such substantial revision of content and organization that the revision would result in a new manuscript.
- **Decline (D):** The manuscript is clearly not appropriate for *NAIS*.

Confidential comments to the editors: