



R Street Responds Submissions Guidelines

What is *R Street Responds*:

Similar to a book review in an academic journal or a study review in a medical journal, the *R Street Responds (RSR)* series is a format that allows an author to provide a scholarly review of a single academic work (book, article, white paper), idea (like an announcement from an agency, etc.) or critique of the author's own published work. Whereas we think of a policy paper as a synthesis of multiple sources and viewpoints to support our own thesis, the *RSR* more closely resembles an academic debate between two colleagues. It is a chance to review the merits of recent scholarship and allows us to get 'on the record' sooner and in a more conversational style.

General Guidelines:

- Must be submitted **within two months of the publication or release of the piece being reviewed**.
- Submissions should be **no more than 1,000 words**. They will appear on our website similar to our blog posts, so submissions any longer than this aren't consistent with the purpose of a blog format.
- Please submit in our standard **Calibri-11 font**.
- Must be **formatted to R Street style** and should **keep in mind our wider audience** (don't use jargon as a shorthand. Explain what you mean so that any R Street reader would understand—and be enlightened by—your critique.)
- **A single, explanatory graph or chart is acceptable** with the appropriate source information, title, caption and link provided to the source of the data.
- **Do not duplicate charts or figures from the reviewed piece**. We'll provide the appropriate link to the reviewed piece on first reference in the text.
- **Citations should be limited to the reviewed piece**, and to **no more than two other sources** to support your assessment of it.
- **Citations should be hyperlinked** to the appropriate words in the text of the review. Consistent with the blog format, these will not have foot/endnotes.

Content Guidelines:

In general, these submissions should follow a basic formula:

1. Provide an overview of the topic and the questions addressed in the piece to which you're responding;
2. Describe its key findings;
3. Provide a discussion/critique of its significance (What does it get right? Wrong? What does it contribute to the field? What's left to be addressed?).

Responses must **contribute something scholarly** to the conversation. This means that they cannot merely summarize the reviewed work. Comments cannot be purely laudatory—nor can they be overly combative in tone or devolve into ad hominem attacks on the author of the reviewed piece. They also should not be used merely to promote the reviewer's own work. The focus should be an objective and diplomatic assessment of what was (or wasn't) learned rather than what the author "did wrong." Accordingly, the bulk of the content must fall under Category #3 above.

****Reviews that do not fit any or all of these criteria will not be considered.****