

## PoLAR Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to review for PoLAR. The work of reviewers is critical for the journal's work. It also serves as an opportunity for the mentorship, collaborative spirit and generosity that we at APLA and PoLAR hope to foster in our discipline.

To this end, we ask for reviews that are substantive, fair, and honest. We rely on your expertise to help us determine the current and potential quality of this manuscript. Authors rely on you for expert insight into how to improve their work, writing, analysis and argumentation, whether or not they are published in this journal.

We recognize the time that reviews take. Reviews can be substantive without being overly long. Your review is usually one of three we solicit. This means we do not need you to speak to everything in the piece, but to highlight the points that you see as most important. We will develop a clear picture of the manuscript's potential by combining your perspective with that of other reviewers (and our own). We value above all your honest assessment of whether the piece has real potential for publication within one or two rounds of revisions.

We find that the most helpful reviews are specific and speak to our core criteria as a journal. This includes a strong, clear argument grounded in ethnographic evidence that speaks to political and legal anthropology broadly conceived. Please consider the following in your assessment:

1. Does this manuscript have an original and clear argument? If not, do you see the beginnings of an argument or a buried argument that could be brought out in a revision?
2. Is the analysis grounded in ethnographic evidence? If not, what kinds of evidence might the author need to make those crucial links? Please be as specific as possible: for example, does the author have interesting ethnographic material that is not sufficiently organized? Is the author missing crucial aspects of contextualization that allow the reader to track with and assess the evidence? Or is there a general lack of ethnographic support and material for claims being made?
3. Is the analysis grounded in sufficient context and knowledge about the place (community, region, country, social network, institution) being studied? Is it interesting, recognizable *and* fresh to scholars of a given social context?
4. Does the piece offer interesting insights for non-regional scholars? Does the author do enough to draw out the comparative, theoretical, political etc. relevance of the analysis outside their area of study?

5. Is the piece well-written, relatively jargon free, and clear? Does the author define concepts and terms, and offer clear and consistent usage of concepts that they are introducing?
6. Is the piece well-organized, and clear in structure and transitions? Would some obvious shifts in structure help bring out the argument, clarify evidence, and flow? Or is the structure too underdeveloped to see any obvious fixes?
7. Finally, it is critical that you offer your perspective on citational practice. We require that authors substantively engage work by a diverse and inclusive group of scholars. We also specifically ask authors to incorporate work by scholars and writers who live and work in the countries, regions, and where possible, communities about which they write. Work can be from within and outside the discipline, and in standard or non-standard academic format. We especially encourage foregrounding the work of BIPOC scholars for both theory and content. Mere citations will not suffice to fulfil this requirement; engagement with the work is necessary. In your assessment, does the author fulfil this criteria? If not, are there works that you would recommend the author consult for developing their manuscript?