Reviewer guidelines – PRACTITIONER’S PERSPECTIVES

The aim of Practitioner’s Perspectives is to bridge the gap between applied ecological research and practical environmental management.

These short articles (<4000 words and <20 references) are designed to provide a platform for individuals involved in hands-on management of ecological resources – be they species, ecosystems or landscapes – to present their personal views on the direction of applied ecological research. At least one author should have direct experience of the practical management of the environment.

When assessing a Practitioner’s Perspective article please comment on:

- What you understand to be the main message/s of the manuscript. Indicate the work’s topicality and strengths.
- Who will be interested in reading the paper, and why (e.g. Policymakers, Practitioners).
- How the work offers a constructive way forward to help bridge the gap between research and the practical management of the environment. Does it make clear recommendations to ensure improved science-based practice? Does it challenge the scientific community to consider the perspectives of individuals addressing applied ecological issues? Could it stimulate policy and management-relevant research? For example, how might future research help address ecological problems more effectively; and how might this be best achieved (e.g. through greater dialogue, joint projects, new research techniques, etc).
- The novelty of the work and whether opinions are supported by a clear evidence base.
- The broad interest of the work. Even if based on a regional study, indicate whether the article is internationally relevant.
- 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 manuscript 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.
- We welcome examples of best practice that may not have made it into the wider academic literature, but we do not want advertorials for the activities of an NGO, company or consultancy.
- 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.