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The Journal of Engineering Technology (JET) is a refereed journal of the Engineering Technology Division of the American Society for Engineering Education and is published in the spring and fall of each year. JET is indexed by the Science Citation Index (SCI) and the Engineering Index (EI).

Peer reviewers are essential to the process of establishing and maintaining a quality professional journal. The editorial board is grateful for your interest and participation, for without you, the journal would not exist.

To help ensure consistency in the process, please follow the guidelines below:

1. Upon manuscript receipt, please notify the manuscript editor immediately, via email, if you cannot conduct the review.

2. Complete the review form that accompanies the manuscript. Please be conscientious about deadlines; reviews are due three weeks (21 days) from receipt. If you cannot meet the deadline, notify the manuscript editor.

3. As you read the manuscript, consider such larger questions as
   Is the content appropriate for the journal?
   Is the purpose clear?
   Is the organization plausible?
   Is the manuscript well written?
   Is the author making a contribution to the literature or simply repeating old information?

4. Check references to ensure that the author(s) has responsibly paraphrased and attributed information appropriately. If you discover academic integrity violations, notify the editor in chief immediately; include the suspect sections and the original source(s). Consider such items as
   Does the manuscript have a sufficient number of references?
   Are references current or appropriate to the topic?
   Has the author discussed the references or used a “laundry list” technique?
   Do references fully support the topic?
   Are the citations in the appropriate format (Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition)?

5. Check graphics; those reprinted from another source should include a permissions statement. The figure caption should include the statement “Reprinted with permission.”
6. Choose one of five possible categories for your decision:
   - **Accept as is**: the manuscript meets all publication specifications and requires only minor copyediting
   - **Accept with minor revisions**: the manuscript meets publication specifications and requires some adjustments by the author
   - **Reject as inappropriate for the journal**: the manuscript may be interesting but the content may not deal with engineering technology
   - **Reject—do not publish**: the manuscript is seriously flawed, either in content or writing
   - **Return to the author for substantial revision**: the manuscript may be promising but has major flaws, such as unclear writing, inadequate explanations, calculation errors, etc.

7. Include comments to the author(s). These should be constructive, allowing the author(s) to revise, and should support your decision in 6 above.

8. Include a marked-up manuscript with the review form, noting areas for revision.

9. Contact the manuscript editor if you have any questions or concerns about the manuscript you are reviewing.

Thank you again for serving as a reviewer for the *Journal of Engineering Technology*. We look forward to your continued participation.