



## Rubric for evaluating reviews

	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Preferred
<b>Comments reflect rubric scores</b>	Review form sections with low scores and/or high scores do not have any specific comments.	Most submission review form sections with low scores have some form of a specific comment.  Use of evidence 1 point: <i>"It seems that there are several ideas you are using that require citations."</i>	Both low and high-scoring sections have a comment.  Theoretical framework 1 point: <i>"It seems that there are several ideas you are using that require citations."</i>  Theoretical framework 3 points: <i>"It was really helpful how you followed up some abstract concepts like 'OOO' with concrete examples."</i>
<b>Concrete examples</b>	Concrete examples not used to support statements.  <i>"This was poorly written."</i>  <i>"This is excellent."</i>	Paraphrases used to support statements.  <i>"In your methods section, it wasn't clear how you analyzed the data."</i>  <i>"Your methods section clearly showed the steps of your analysis and it was easy to follow."</i>	Direct quotes used to support statements.  <i>"In your methods section, you wrote 'the data was then statistically analyzed' but you didn't write how."</i>  <i>"In your methods section, 'the data was analyzed by 'OOO' and then 'OOO' clearly showed the reader how you did your analysis."</i>
<b>Actionable</b>	It is not clear to the author what action needs to be taken.  <i>"The writing needs to be improved."</i>	Problems are clearly specified, but possible solutions are not shared.  <i>"Many language teachers will have difficulty understanding this idea."</i>	Problems are clearly specified, and possible solutions are shared.  <i>"Many language teachers will have difficulty understanding this idea. How about first defining what 'OOO' is, and describing how 'OOO' relates to language teaching."</i>
<b>Logical progression</b>	Comments refer to sections of the submission in random sequence.  <i>"I liked your discussion section, but your introduction was unclear."</i>	Specific comments employ a logical progression through the paper (from start to finish).  <i>"The abstract is strong, but the introduction is somewhat lacking clarity."</i>	Specific comments are organized by section of the paper and grouped by type.  <i>"In your introduction, the structure is clear, but the argument could be stronger."</i> <i>"In the methodology section, the statistical analysis is unclear."</i>
<b>Tone</b>	Comments are terse, and overwhelmingly negative without any constructive advice. Also comments regarding the character of the author.  <i>"This section is poorly written and confusing."</i>	Comments may seem terse or cold, but they are largely constructive with a focus on how to improve.  <i>"This section needs improvement, especially in clarifying your main points."</i>	Comments focus on how to improve and are also compassionate, helping to maintain the author's motivation to take on revisions.  <i>"This section would be stronger with clearer examples. You've done a good job laying the groundwork, so just a bit more clarity will make it excellent."</i>

**Note to reviewers:** This is the rubric the editorial team will use for evaluating reviews. Please, make sure your review matches the criteria described in the rubric.