University Press of Colorado | University of Alaska Press
Utah State University Press | University of Wyoming Press

1624 Market Street, Suite 226 ♦ PMB 39883 ♦ Denver, CO 80202-1559 ♦ 720-406-8849 ♦ www.upcolorado.com

GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEW REPORTS

Peer review is critical for the success of scholarly publishing with a university press, and we are **deeply grateful for your professional thoughts** on this manuscript. We hope that you find it equally gratifying to know that you are influencing the shape of published scholarship in the field.

Please prepare a **short (2-4 pages) review** of the manuscript, and respond to the questions below. We ask you to bring your expertise to this manuscript, but also to consider your own positionality in your responses, as well as multiple perspectives surrounding the work. We consider peer review a tool to help authors make their strongest possible contributions to their fields, whether publication happens with us or another publisher, and to that end we request that you **please provide actionable feedback and be detailed** in your response.

Please bear in mind that we receive a generous supply of worthy submissions in this field, and we must be very selective as a consequence.

1. What are the main arguments and conclusions of this manuscript?
2. In your view, is the manuscript a valuable contribution to its field? How does this work relate to other larger research agendas within the field?
3. Do you find the manuscript well written and well organized? Appropriate in tone, voice, and scholarship for the audience it aims to reach? Do you feel the manuscript length is appropriate for the subject? If not, would you point us to places where it could or should be shortened or expanded? (No need for copy-editorial comments here; if published, the book would be thoroughly copyedited and proofread.)
4. Is the work inclusive in terms of contributor representation, how its audience is addressed, and citations? Do you feel the manuscript has engaged diverse voices and considered perspectives beyond a limited view? Can you suggest ways in which the manuscript can better do that work?
5. If this manuscript utilizes figures, do you feel that the included images were appropriate and useful additions to the manuscript? Are there any images you believe can be removed?
6. What is the audience (or audiences) for this manuscript and does it have potential for course adoption? If the answer for course adoption is yes, what level course would be appropriate for this book?
7. Do you know of any existing publications that you consider competitive with or comparable to this manuscript? Are there any that should be engaged more thoroughly?
8. In terms of its quality, audience, and subject matter, do you feel this would be a publication suitable for the University Press of Colorado?
9. Please add any other comments you feel are necessary to give a full evaluation of the work.

Please also **complete the enclosed checklist** so that we're sure we clearly understand your recommendation and we can send you proper compensation. Most of all, thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript and offer your thoughts.