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Dear Reviewer, thank you for contributing to the IJGLL by assessing the content and overall quality of the manuscripts submitted for publication. Your timely input is of great value to the editors and authors. The editors know well how much your service contributes to moving this professional field further. The IJGLL’s publications undergo a double-blind review process where two or three reviewers will assess a given manuscript using the criteria below. Please, read each one of the criterion and rate accordingly. Your recommendations for improvement are highly valuable as those would go directly to the Author(s). The deadline for the submission of this review has been provided in the original communication you received via email. When in doubt about anything pertaining to this review process feel free to contact the IJGLL Managing Editor: [ijgll@mnstate.edu](mailto:ijgll@mnstate.edu). Thank you!

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Before you Start** | | | | | |
| If you are unable to conduct a fair and unbiased review, contact the Managing Editor. This issue may be generated by virtue of you deducing the Author(s)’ nationality, religious belief, sexual orientation, political position, philosophical lens, or commercial association and acknowledging bias by that information. | | | | | |
| If you suspect that the research publication ethics may have been violated by the submitting Author(s) contact the Managing Editor (e.g., treatment of human subjects, plagiarism, repeated submissions to different journals). | | | | | |
| Be aware of language issues that may result from Authors not speaking English as their first language. | | | | | |
| **The Essential** | | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | |
| **Criterion** | **Write Recommendations for Improvement** | 0  Missing | 1 | 2 | 3  Fully  Included |
| The manuscript fits the IJGLL’s Aims and Scope |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Title** identifies main variables under investigation and the target population. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Abstract** identifies the problem under investigation, the research questions and hypotheses, the methods, findings, and conclusions (i.e., implications, applications). |  |  |  |  |  |
| At least 3 **Keywords** have been identified. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Introduction** clearly states the problem, makes a case for the significance of the study, provides a succinct review of relevant literature, identifies the theoretical or conceptual framework, links study to the literature (e.g., replication, filling a gap, alternative lens), states hypotheses (Hs), and/or research questions (RQs). Qualitative studies include a description of the approach to inquiry (e.g., interpretive, CRT, feminist). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Literature Review** follows the *funnel approach* (i.e., from generic and seminal studies to specific and current), defines and clarifies the problem, it is organized around the variables of study, it identifies relations, contradictions, and gaps in the current literature, and estimates the contributions of the study in light of the current literature. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Literature Review** includes a theoretical or conceptual framework. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Method** describes the research paradigm and design, both of which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. Qualitative studies include a description of the approach to inquiry (e.g., interpretive, CRT, feminist). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Method** describes the subjects’ (i.e., nonhuman research) or participants’ (i.e., human research) inclusion/exclusion criteria and their major characteristics (e.g., educational level), which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. There is a clear indication that the study received approval from an ethics committee or an institutional review board. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Method** describes the sampling procedures (i.e., sampling method, return/participation rate, data collection settings, data collection dates) and sample size, which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Method** describes the instruments used for data collection purposes and their technical quality (i.e., coefficients of validity and reliability when measuring psychological or psychoeducational constructs), which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Method** describes the data collection procedures (e.g., virtual focus group, in-person interview, mailing questionnaire), which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. For qualitative studies, this section describes the relationships and interactions between researchers and participants. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The overall procedures described in the **Method** allow for the replication of this study. For qualitative studies, there is a general sense of methodological integrity (e.g., member checking). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Results** for quantitative research report statistical analyses, level of significance, power, confidence intervals, and effect size, which are aligned to the study’s Hs and RQs. Any issues with the statistical assumptions that may impact the validity of the results are reported. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Results** for qualitative research report the coding process, describe the units of analysis (e.g., entire transcript, text), and the specific strategy which are aligned to the study’s RQs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Results** for mixed-methods research: See criteria for quantitative & qualitative research combined. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Results** include tables and figures that adequately support understanding of relevant data sets. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Results** include statements of support or nonsupport to the study’s Hs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The **Discussion** presents similarities and differences of the study’s results with the current literature and provides an interpretation of the results in light of the limitations of the study, its generalizability, the actionable implications for practice, and actionable recommendations for future research. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bias-Free Language | |  |  |  |  |
| **Racial and ethnic groups** are designated by proper nouns and are capitalized (e.g., Black, White, Native American, Indigenous, Aboriginal People). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acknowledges **people’s humanity**: Uses adjectival forms (e.g., gay men instead of *the gay*) or nouns with descriptive phrases (e.g., people living in poverty, people with learning disabilities instead of *learning disabled people*). |  |  |  |  |  |
| No **false hierarchies** have been included: There is no use of the word “normal.” No group is used as the universal standard. Groups are presented in alphabetical order. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Operational definitions and labels** are used: Any abbreviations must be accompanied by the full spelled out name the first time it is used (e.g., Council for Exceptional Children / CEC), after which the abbreviation is freely used. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No **Gender bias**: “Men” and “women” are used as these terms are more inclusive of all ages and all genders (avoid using *males* and *females*). |  |  |  |  |  |
| No **Gender identity bias**: Avoids genderism (i.e., assuming that there are only two genders) and cisgenderism (i.e., assuming that all are cisgender). |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender and pronoun usage**: Uses the singular “they” to avoid making assumptions about an individual’s gender. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replaces *achievement gap* with **“opportunity gap”** to highlight the impact that the context in which people live impact their outcomes. |  |  |  |  |  |