

Reviewer's guidelines for article submission.

The points presented below were designed to help guide the student in the development of his or her letter in terms of structural format, article review requirements, and character analysis and proverbial statement specifications. Since each requirement is presented in a step-by-step format, this guideline sheet also provides the instructor with a very clear rubric for assessment purposes.

The Royal Society for the Advancement of Genetic Analysis



Veritas Per Explorationem

3001 Queen Victoria Rd. SE1
London, England

Reviewer's guidelines for article submission

The following represent the guidelines that need to be followed to ensure that submissions to RSAGA can be evaluated by our editorial staff in an effective manner. Please keep in mind that the editors affiliated with both RSAGA and RSPGH pride themselves on asking members to analyze and review selected works in creative ways, especially in terms of how the content presented in a particular work can be applied to other disciplines.

In light of this, please consider the following requirements carefully before submitting your final report. Be sure that each item listed is clearly identifiable in your final product. Again, submissions that fail to address these requirements run the risk of not being accepted for further review and, as a consequence, may not be published.

Overall review format

1. All submissions must be in the form of a single-spaced letter, addressed to Lady Lednem at the Royal Society for the Advancement of Genetic Analysis (please use the cover letter within this packet as a guide). Our editorial staff will frown upon any submissions that do not include the editor-in-chief's name and address. Additionally, all letters should be printed on official letterhead that includes your full name and degree (if you are a fellow of RSAGA, please include these letters after your degree), your official academic rank (e.g., adjunct professor, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor), and the address of your current academic institution.
2. Each submitted letter must begin with an official "statement of appreciation" addressed to RSAGA and a detailed description of the topics you have included in your submitted report (see "Article contents" section below).
3. The letter should be typed using Times New Roman font (or an appropriate equivalent) and should be in 12 point (or an appropriate equivalent).

Review contents

1. Following the opening paragraph (see "Overall article format" above), you are to generate a single paragraph that focuses on the following:
 - a. A concise synopsis of the historical information presented in the work (that is, provide an overall description of the historical events that are presented in the text in a manner that will allow the editor to understand, at least in a general sense, this particular point in history).
 - b. Provide two strengths that reflect the way in which the historical facts are presented in the work. These strengths can reference the accuracy of the historical facts, the details surrounding the facts, or the manner in which the author presents these facts.
 - c. Provide two weaknesses that reflect the way in which the historical facts are presented in the work. These weaknesses can reference the accuracy of the historical facts, the details surrounding the facts, or the manner in which the author presents these facts.
2. Following the paragraph dealing with the historical attributes of the work under review (see above), you are to generate a single paragraph that focuses on the following:
 - a. A concise synopsis of how genetic technology is presented in the work (that is, provide an overall description of which technologies are being employed, why they are being employed, and what information the investigators can gain from using these technologies. Again, please be sure that you provide the editor with enough background that he or she can understand the role that genetic technology plays in this work.)

b. Provide two strengths that reflect the way in which the genetic technologies are presented in the work. These strengths can reference how accurately the technologies are described, the manner in which they are used in the work, or the manner in which the author presents these facts.

c. Provide two weaknesses that reflect the way in which the genetic technologies are presented the work. These weaknesses can reference how accurately the technologies are described, the manner in which they are used in the work, or the manner in which the author presents these facts.

3. For this section of your review, our editorial staff would like you to choose one of the characters described in the work and (in a brief 2–3 sentence paragraph) create your own personal evaluation of the individual. The following questions may aid you in your assessment:

- Did you feel sorry for the character?
- Did the character, in your opinion, project a strong “quality” during a particularly difficult period of time?
- Did you feel that the character was weak and may have been the cause of his or her own downfall?
- Do you feel that history may have misrepresented or misjudged this particular character?
- Did you feel that, in the end, this particular character deserved the treatment that he or she received from others during this time period?

Regardless of the manner in which you choose to evaluate the individual, please be sure that your explanation is thorough and well constructed.

4. The editors at RSAGA and RSPGH have recently been made aware of an initiative to have all new literary works that are mutually reviewed by our two societies “defined” by a short, succinct, proverbial statement.

For example, if one were to “define” a story in which a character finally achieves a lifelong goal, a short, proverbial statement to describe this story might be “Good things come to those who wait,” or in the case of a villain finally meeting his or her demise, one might write “Crime doesn’t pay.” Some other proverbial statements include “Heavy is the head that wears the crown” or “He who laughs last, laughs best.”

As these examples are common, our editors would like you to design your own *original* proverbial statement and explain (in a short 2–3 sentence paragraph) why this statement is an accurate reflection of this work.