

Article Reviews for *Journal of Good Research in World Politics*

In your **first** paragraph, give three things:

- what the author does
 - the research communities interested in/affected by this piece
 - your general recommendation
-
- In main body of your review, talk about specific strengths and weaknesses; things you think will give this piece it's impact, adjustments they could make to give it greater impact. (This is the *most basic* aspect of "Motivation")
 - Give points that you thought were unclear – poorly defined concepts, unclear connections made between these concepts, lack of clarity in their argument.... (This is the *most basic* aspect of "Design")
 - Can you follow their procedures? Could you go to a good university library (or the Web) and find their information (i.e., "evidence"), can you follow the procedures they described to obtain the results they present to undergird their knowledge claims? (i.e., Is this study "reproducible" in the most basic sense). (This is the *most basic* aspect of "Execution")

Regarding more specific and finer points of Motivation, Design and Execution you should look to your notes on "How to Recognize Good Research When You See It".

Now in your conclusion, you may give your recommendation to the editor more confidently. You should list the specific steps you want the author to take to move this draft toward publishability. i.e., try to imagine that the author did *exactly* what you asked, and that the editor came back to you for your opinion about the revised version. Would you then advise publication? If not, you probably haven't been specific enough in your recommendations.