

Title of paper:

Youth Studies Australia aims to provide up-to-date research and practice information for people working in the youth field. YSA encourages authors to communicate to a wide, often non-academic, audience. Papers that have been peer reviewed for YSA may therefore differ in appearance and length from those in traditional scholarly journals, but must nevertheless meet similar criteria.

Contributors are asked to write to a **word length** of no more than 4,000 words (including references and headings); therefore, background reading and the methodology or 'science' need to be summarised very succinctly. Authors are encouraged to focus on findings, discussion, implications and recommendations. While the authors' demonstration of knowledge of the literature is very important, it need not be unnecessarily expansive. The space available should be used to 'advance' knowledge of the issue or subject, with common knowledge accepted as 'given'.

Reviewers are asked to complete the two templates below, while considering the following factors:

- the **originality** of the material,
- the **appropriateness** of approach and design,
- the **policy implications** and/or relevancy of the material, and
- the **effectiveness** of figures and tables.¹

Reviewers may also make specific comments on the manuscript. We ask reviewers not to correct deficiencies in style or mistakes in grammar, but they are encouraged to identify any unclear, repetitive or ambiguous passages, and any need to reorganise content or condense particular passages. After peer review, if the paper is accepted, the manuscript will be **edited** for style, grammar, spelling and construction by YSA editorial staff.

We use a 'blind' review system in that the author is not identified to the reviewers and the reviewers are not identified to the author. However, anonymous reviewer comments may be forwarded to the author(s). If you wish to direct comments to the editor only, please include a separate note labelled 'For the editor only'.

We ask reviewers to distinguish between **revisions** considered essential and those considered desirable. In addition, because editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to act on every recommendation. Please note that the **decision** to accept or reject a paper will be made by the in-house editorial team.

If reviewers suggest revision, you may be asked to check the revised paper.

¹ Sections of this document have been adapted from the *Health Care Financing Review*.

Please read guidelines before indicating each score with an 'x'

Standard achieved	Very high	Good	Fair	Weak	Very poor
1 Knowledge of substantive issues in a particular area of youth studies.					
2 Level of conformity of the research, review or practice to standards acceptable to the particular field of study.					
3 Conclusion as a logical interpretation of the authors' research, review or practice.					
4 Discussion of relevant literature and research/practice, and its reflection in the literature sourced. (Please take into account word limit.)					
5 Contribution of paper to the body of knowledge on the subject.					
6 Suitability of content and style of the paper for a wide, often non-academic, audience.					
7 Interest for the readership of <i>Youth Studies Australia</i> .					
8 Suitability for publication as peer-reviewed paper in <i>Youth Studies Australia</i>.					

NB: The following text boxes will expand as you type!

Reasons for recommendation (optional):

--

Please specify any revisions required:

Essential revisions (paper to be revised by authors before acceptance).	Desirable revisions (paper can be accepted: editor or authors to revise)

Note: Comments may be edited, summarised and sent in anonymous form to author(s).

Feel free to attach additional notes:

--

Thank you for reviewing the paper. Please return as soon as possible to: susan.headley@utas.edu.au