

The *CDQ* Review Process

Thank you for agreeing to review a manuscript for *Communication Design Quarterly (CDQ)*. We appreciate your time and help with this process and ask that you please return your review of the manuscript within thirty (30) days of receipt.

If you believe that your review constitutes a conflict of interest,¹ please let *CDQ* know as soon as possible so that we may find a different reviewer for this manuscript.

We ask that you keep the following in mind as you consider your review:

- Please do your best to avoid any unconscious bias in your review. *CDQ* has recently [published an inclusivity and anti-racism statement on its website](#), and the third paragraph in that statement provides guidelines for anti-racist reviewing.
- Please keep in mind that this is an interdisciplinary journal, which means that authors might be drawing from a different body of literature than you are accustomed to. We don't want to reject articles primarily because they are situated in a different disciplinary conversation because *CDQ* itself has no defined disciplinary affiliation.

We hope the following questions help guide your review of this manuscript. As you complete your review, please be aware that your responses will be shared (anonymously) with both the author(s) of the manuscript and the other reviewers. Thank you for your service to the journal.

CDQ Review Guidelines/Questions

1. Does the topic address issues relevant to communication design and/or related theoretical commitments? How so or not?
2. What, in your opinion, are the strengths of this manuscript? Among other issues, you might consider, for example, the strength of the original contribution, how the paper is organized, how compelling the ideas are, and how the author handles relevant diversity issues.
3. What are the weaknesses of the manuscript, and what steps should the author(s) take to address these weaknesses effectively?
4. If relevant (this may not apply to some Experience Reports), is the research design and methodology clearly articulated, and does the research design support the argument? Does the design and methodology approach and/or represent participants with the care appropriate to the communities represented?

¹ A conflict of interest may arise due to shared employment locations, power differentials (student/teacher relationships, for example), or recognized bias toward a person, topic, or methodological approach. If you believe that your review cannot be objective, please do not hesitate to contact the editor. In such a case, you need not disclose any details other than stating that a conflict of interest exists.

5. Are there any sources the reader should be citing (but is not) in examining the ideas covered in the manuscript, and do those sources include a diverse group of authors and perspectives? If this is an Experience Report, are there similar experiences the author(s) should be covering?
6. Are sufficient examples, illustrations, tables, and/or figures included, and is descriptive alt-text provided for those requiring it? Do you have suggestions for making the alt-text more effective?
7. Does the manuscript avoid sexist, racist, ableist, or other biased language or metaphors?
8. Does the manuscript consider *Communication Design Quarterly's* international audience and avoid cultural bias?
9. Are there any additional revisions you would suggest to help the author(s) improve the quality of this manuscript?
10. On a scale of 1–5 (1 being little interest, 5 being great interest) how would you rate the level of interest that the manuscript under review is likely to generate with *CDQ's* audience?
1 2 3 4 5
11. How would you rank this entry in terms of publication readiness?

Accept as is

Accept with minor revisions

Revise and re-submit

Reject

Thank you again for your time and help with this process.