Reviewer guidelines – POLICY DIRECTIONS

This is a paper type for policy pieces, relating to policy directions, decision-making and implementation. The focus of these articles should be on informing and improving policy, rather than critiques, and any opinions should be supported by a clear evidence base. Articles should be set within a broad policy context and relate to the wider issues around constrained decision making and should be <4000 words.

When assessing a Policy Direction article please comment on:

- What you understand to be the main message/s of the manuscript, paying particular attention to the policy focus of the work. Indicate the work’s topicality and strengths.
- Whether the paper has direct policy relevance and can be explicitly used as evidence to inform and improve policy.
- Whether opinions are supported by a clear evidence base.
- Whether the work helps to bridge the gap between research and policy implementation.
- Whether the paper is set within a broad policy context and relates to the wider issues around constrained decision making.
- Whether the specific policy instruments that should be modified as a result of the findings of the study are clearly identified.
- Whether the paper clearly informs the academic community about the concerns and needs of the authors and could stimulate policy and management-relevant research.
- Whether in the context of the existing literature and current knowledge what is the significance, interest, international relevance and importance of the work and is it novel or mainly confirmatory.
- How the work could be improved, stating any major flaws or weaknesses and what the severity of their impact is on the paper, and identifying any similar or relevant work, which has not been acknowledged. As with any paper review, if you suspect ethical issues of concerns in relation to this work, please raise this with the editor, providing as much detail as possible.
- The quality of the presentation: Is the paper clearly written, succinct and accessible, and how could it be made more clear or accessible to nonspecialists. The article should be written with the minimum of technical language and jargon, so as to be understandable to a general audience. Are title and keywords are appropriate, and the tables and figures clear, sufficient and correctly labelled.

For Early-Career researchers with little experience of reviewing please also take a look at our general Guide to peer review.