



Guidelines for Peer Reviewers of Articles for *AI Practitioner*

Website: <https://aipractitioner.com/>

Contact: ajpeditor@editorproofreader.co.uk or info@aipractitioner.com

AI Practitioner, the global journal for practitioners and researchers in Appreciative Inquiry (AI), highlights examples, case studies and research on strength-based approaches to change with special emphasis on Appreciative Inquiry. AI is about the search for the best in people, their organisations and the relevant world around them. It has been called a way of knowing, a process for managing change and a strengths-based relational approach to leadership and human development. It draws on the power of stories, metaphor, relational ways of knowing, the significance of language and generative thinking.

The review process

Contributors will be asked to tell the editors of the issue when they submit their article to choose between an open or a double-blind review process. If the contributor chooses an open peer review, the editorial team for the issue will be responsible for working with them to edit and finalise the document.

If the contributor chooses a double-blind review process, once the article has been accepted, the managing editor of *AI Practitioner* will contact, from the list of those who have agreed, a suitable reviewer regarding their availability.

- The purpose of peer reviews is to help authors improve their article by offering constructive feedback.
- *AI Practitioner* upholds the principles of Appreciative Inquiry. Experience as a practitioner of and/or researcher in AI is one of the criteria for consideration as a peer reviewer. Peer reviewers help to ensure the quality of the article and support the integrity of the journal. In keeping with AI principles, peer reviewers are expected to act ethically, to be accountable, and to communicate with the editors of the journal in a timely and professional way. If any conflicts or problems arise, contact the managing editor as soon as possible to let the journal know that you will not be able to peer review the article as agreed, and why.
- Before agreeing to be a peer reviewer for a particular issue, consider whether it is in your area of interest and expertise. As well, think about potential conflicts of interest that might arise. Ensure that you have the time available to review the article: analysing, editing and commenting on an article takes time. And, if you are available as a reviewer, reply promptly to the invitation.
- Once the editors have decided on the articles and worked with the contributors, they will decide when to contact you directly, usually by email. The editors will be looking for a fair, honest and unbiased assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the article or paper.

When reviewing an article

- The standard reference for *AI Practitioner* is the APA style guide. The style guide for contributors and guest editors is on the *AIP* website at <https://aipractitioner.com/>.
- Please keep the content of any articles you are reviewing confidential. If you have written a similar article or have reviewed the article previously, let the editors know of the conflict as soon as possible.
- Keep your comments within the scope of the paper and the issue of *AI Practitioner* that the article will appear in. It is important to remain unbiased with regard to the authors' nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other personal characteristics that may be expressed in their work.
- The goal of reviewing the articles is to review the accuracy of the submission, strengthen and improve it. Please focus on constructive comments, even if you suggest that the article not be included in the issue.
- It helps if you can prioritise your suggestions, for example by numbering your comments or putting them directly in the MS Word document using Track Changes. Keep comments to authors separate from confidential ones for the editors. Most feedback should be put in the report that the authors will see.
- If the author is not a native speaker, try to be helpful when pointing out areas where the meaning is unclear or what they have written may not mean what they intended. Keep in mind that it is the author's paper, so do not try to rewrite it if it is basically sound, accurate and clear, even if it is not written in a style you would choose.
- If you have concerns about, for example, irregularities or misconduct of some kind, please let the editors and the managing editor of *AI Practitioner* know in confidence.
- If the paper is excellent and a good addition to the existing literature, say so!

After the peer review is finished

Please return your review by the deadline agreed with the editors. If anything comes to light that would make you change your evaluation of the article, please contact the editors. Continue to respect the confidentiality of the review process unless you have the agreement of the author and the managing editor of *AI Practitioner*, ajpeditor@editorproofreader.co.uk or info@aipractitioner.com.