INSTRUCTIONS TO MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS

When assessing a manuscript, please use the following categories.

1. Objectives and main arguments

Is the subject of the article within the scope of the journal? Does the title clearly and sufficiently reflect its content? What are the manuscript's objectives and main arguments? What larger conceptual or theoretical points does it make? Is this a new and original contribution? Are the interpretations and conclusions sound and justified by the data? What does the manuscript add to our understanding of British Columbia?

2. Soundness of scholarship and methodology

How well is the manuscript researched, argued, and organized? Are the illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable? Are the references adequate and are they all necessary?

3. Significance

How important is it that this manuscript be published? How significant is its contribution to understanding aspects of British Columbia? How broadly based will its readership be?

4. General judgment

Do you have any suggestions for improving the manuscript? How accessible is it to readers? Can you suggest brief additions or amendments (words, phrases) or an introductory statement that will increase the value of this paper? Can you suggest any reductions in the paper, or deletions of parts? Would the manuscript be more effective if re-conceptualized, reorganized, shortened, or tightened up? Please be as explicit as possible.

5. Recommendation

Please let us know whether, in your best judgment, the manuscript should be:

- published as it stands,
- published subject to satisfactory revision,
- resubmit for review,
- returned as unsuitable for publication in BC Studies
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