

Water Diplomacy Handbook: Peer Review Guidelines

Overview

Thank you for considering reviewing a chapter of the Water Diplomacy Handbook. Our vision for this Handbook is to provide an accessible reference for those seeking dialogue opportunities and negotiated resolutions to water conflicts, whether at the transnational, subnational, or community scale.

Your review will help the author(s) refine their chapter to ensure its discussion of these often-messy topics delivery is as clear and insightful as possible.

A few notes about the process:

- The process will be single-blind. While you know the authors' names, we will not share your name with the authors (though you are welcome to do so).
- All chapters under review are "invited" chapters, so we are not asking reviewers to comment on whether the chapter should be published. Instead, we are looking for actionable feedback on sharpening the chapter's arguments and presentation of ideas.
- Our contributor community includes a mix of professional backgrounds - spanning research to practice. We expect that practice-oriented chapters may have fewer supporting references and rely to a greater degree on personal experience. Still, you are welcome to recommend references you feel are relevant to the author's arguments and claims.
- These chapters are short compared with the topics they cover. Authors have the challenge of writing succinctly, balancing the need to highlight key insights while providing sufficient context to make those insights actionable. Any suggestions you can make about this balance will be greatly appreciated.

Recommended Format for Feedback

We recommend the following feedback format:

- **Begin with a summary.** Briefly describe the chapter, its key insights, and its relevance to Water Diplomacy in your own words. What is the primary goal of the chapter? What is the chapter *not* trying to do? This summary will help the author understand how others interpret their work and the clarity of their arguments.

- **Comment on title and abstract.** Based on your previous summary, do you feel the abstract (if provided) and title are appropriate? If you saw the title listed in the table of contents (before reading the chapter), do you think you'd know what the chapter would cover?
- **List the overall strengths of the chapter.** Provide a brief description or bulleted list of the strongest aspects of the chapter (e.g., structure, clarity, level of detail).
- **List high-level recommendations for improvement.** Provide a brief description or bulleted list of high-level recommendations on what the author should focus on in the next round of revisions.
- **Provide specific comments.** Please provide any other specific feedback either as comments directly in the Word document or as a list with page numbers or headings so authors can find the particular section to which your comments apply.

Note: You are welcome to provide feedback directly in the draft chapter or as a separate document. Some formats, like Microsoft Word, track information about who edited the file and who left comments by default. If you are concerned about your anonymity as a reviewer, please let us know so we can make sure this information is removed.

Thank you again for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to reach out.