GUIDE TO REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS

The Editors of Economic Geography rely on a high-quality and extremely rigorous peer-review process to determine whether manuscripts are of sufficient quality to warrant publication. We ask that all reviewers provide a critical but constructive and substantive assessment that identifies the strengths and weaknesses of a manuscript. Please consider the following when evaluating a manuscript and writing a review:

1. Does the paper make a significant contribution to theories, concepts, methods, and/or debates and dialogues in the field of economic geography, broadly considered? Do you consider the paper to be of major importance or only minor importance? How original is it? Is this paper sufficiently different from other published work to warrant publication?

2. Is the material clearly presented? Are the purpose and rationale for the paper clearly specified? Is the writing style of suitable quality? Are there some passages that should be stated more succinctly? Some that should be deleted?

3. Are the methods, reasoning, and interpretations sound? Do the empirics support the conclusions? Does the author relate the findings of this study to those of previous studies?

4. Is the relevant literature sufficiently referenced and understood?

5. Are the illustrations and tables suitable, are they all necessary, and are they of publishable quality?

6. What do you consider to be the major flaws in the paper? In your view, can these be remedied by revisions? How might the paper be improved?

7. Do you recommend acceptance, rejection, or revision of the manuscript?

If you would like to make additional comments on the manuscript, please do so and return them with your review. We will send your written comments to the author anonymously.