Review Rubric for Tutorials

Reviewers: Please complete and return this form when reviewing a manuscript. If you have annotated the manuscript, please return that file with this form.

Review Design: The review rubric is designed to allow you to quantify your responses to various features of the manuscript and provide notes to support your responses. As such:

- If you highlight 3, 2, or 1, identify what is absent in the section of the manuscript.
- If you highlight 6, 5, or 4, identify ways to strengthen that section in ways that would lead to a publication decision or otherwise improve the manuscript.

Manuscript File Code:	
Manuscript Title:	

Comment Category 1: Publishing Recommendation

Please highlight only one recommendation:	Accept	Accept with minor revisions	Revise and resubmit for consideration	Reject
Please briefly explain your decision:				

Comment Category 2: Overall Fit with the *Transactions*

Does the manuscript clearly fall within the scope and address the audience of our *Transactions* (https://procomm.ieee.org/transactions-of-professional-communication/)?

Yes No

Does the manuscript cite literature in technical and professional communication (and other fields if appropriate) that our readers interested in the topic will be familiar with?

Yes No

Comment Category 3: Abstract

The abstract (200-250 words) is structured using the following subheadings: Introduction, Key Concepts, Key Lessons, and Implications for Practice.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

Notes on Abstract:

Comment Category 4: Introduction

The introduction situates the tutorial and explains its significance to professional communication. It clearly explains its purpose and relevance to *Transactions* readers, states the research questions, and forecasts the organization of the article. Finally, if human subjects were involved in the preparation of the tutorial, this section must indicate that an Institutional Review Board or its equivalent has approved the study or that it was exempt.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

Notes on Introduction:

Comment Category 5: Key Concepts

This section presents key concepts in the literature that provide the context for the tutorial. It describes the theoretical framework or perspective underlying the tutorial, explains how the literature was selected, and explores a limited number of broad themes. For each theme, it provides a definition, defines important terms and concepts, relates the theme to key lessons in the next section, and provides examples from practice. References are current and relevant to Transactions readers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

Notes on Key Concepts:

Comment Category 6: Key Lessons

This section synthesizes the research into heuristics or lessons for practice. Each key lesson is clearly explained, with terms and concepts defined. Each lesson is supported by the key concepts presented in the previous section. The section also explains how to apply each lesson, supported by examples from practice.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

Notes on Key Lessons:

Comment Category 7: Implications for Practice

This section closes the article by describing the tutorial's broader implications for practice. It clearly describes the implications for applying the key lessons. The implications are obviously related to the key concepts and key lessons, are plausible, and they explore each of these implications for implementation, qualitative or quantitative results in the real world, and/or reactions of professionals who have experienced an implementation.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2	1

Notes on Implications for Practice:

Comment Category 8: Reviewer Notes

Please provide any additional integrative notes on the manuscript related to your publishing recommendation. Please pay special attention to the content of the manuscript in relationship to the study sections noted above.

Note: If the manuscript exceeds 7500 words, excluding references, please suggest how the author might cut the manuscript to comply with that limit.