

## **AHSN Review Guidelines**

### A. Purposes of reviewing:

1. Ensure quality and relevance of the topic
2. Support humour scholars who often have inadequate guidance
3. Point author towards overlooked links/resources

### B. Desiderata:

1. Courtesy (no irony, please!) and supportiveness
2. Practicality – if requiring revisions, provide specifics
3. Avoid one-line reviews, especially if negative
4. Agree to review proposals where reasonable, even if outside immediate area of expertise

### C. Questions for the reviewer to consider:

- Is the question or issue clearly stated?
- Does it argue its case well or reasonably well?
- Is the proposed work or thought original?
- Is relevant previous work appropriately cited (too much/too little: suggested maximum 5 references)?
- Are methods, data (collection), and analysis procedures well-designed and appropriate to the issue?
- Are the conceptual framework, theoretical analysis and conclusions coherent?
- Is the abstract clearly written and organized?
- Is the topic timely and current for humour studies and related fields?
- Is the paper likely to be of interest to (attract) attendees?

### D. Practical suggestions

- Keep a soft copy of your review, especially if requiring revisions, so that you can check the points have been addressed
- Feel free to reach out to the Review Co-ordinator if in any doubt about your task or ability to do the job
- Avoid colloquialisms (to assist Non-English-Speaking Background communications)