

**Editorial Policy Manual**  
***Occasional Papers of the BSG***  
**Executive Council of the BSG**

Draft Version1, Roger Sanders & Todd Wood, 30 October 2007

Draft Versrion2, 15 November 2007

Draft Versrion2.1, 20 February 2008

**Approved 27 February 2008**

1) Editorial Process

a) Manuscript submission

- i) Authors are to submit papers to executive editor by post or (preferably) by e-mail (see Manuscript Guidelines, Appendix A). One or more potential reviewers should be suggested.
- ii) Executive editor sends author acknowledgment of receipt.
- iii) Executive editor reads paper and determines suitability. Papers failing to comply with Guidelines for Authors (below) Section 3 b), c), d) will be sent for immediate revision if possible or rejected. If the executive editor detects a serious or fatal flaw in the argument or evidence, the paper may also be rejected at this stage at the sole discretion of the executive editor. If the executive editor believes that the author's work or concept has potential, the executive editor may offer (at the editor's discretion) to advise or tutor the author in producing a suitable manuscript. Papers failing to comply with Manuscript Guidelines e-ii), or f) or significantly departing from a) will be returned for immediate revision. At the editor's discretion, other departures from the Manuscript Guidelines may be corrected during the normal revision process.

b) Editorial Assignment

- i) Once a paper is judged to be suitable, the executive editor ranks the expertise of the associate editors and him- or herself relative to the subject of the paper.
- ii) The editor with the highest suitability rank is contacted with the title and abstract of the paper and asked to determine if editing the paper constitutes a conflict of interest. Also if there would be a problem finding enough qualified reviewers such that this editor would need to review the paper or there is some other extenuating circumstances, the executive editor should be informed. If none of these is a problem, the editor is assigned the paper and is provided a copy of the manuscript, along with an updated list of potential reviewers by the executive editor.
- iii) If the author submitted a paper copy and is unable to submit a digital version, the executive editor will scan the manuscript (after deleting the author's name and contact information) to facilitate transport among editors and reviewers.
- iv) If the executive editor or highest ranked associate editor does have a conflict of interest or other prohibitive circumstance, the next ranked editor is contacted, and so on.
- v) If the executive editor is the highest ranked editor, then the paper can be sent for review immediately.

- vi) The executive editor should communicate the name and contact information of the editor handling the paper to the author. The author should be encouraged to send all correspondence about the submission to the editor handling the paper. When a paper is edited by an associate editor and not the executive editor, then the executive editor should not be included on correspondence regarding the review or status of the manuscript.
- c) Handling of Peer Review
  - i) The editor responsible for the paper determines the areas of expertise required of reviewers (may be two or more areas, e.g., molecular phylogenetics and herpetology) and contacts potential reviewers. Minimum of two reviewers are needed for papers; only one is needed for conference abstracts. Controversial topics may require four or more reviews. A controversial topic might be an argument that could upset some readers or a particularly startling or exciting discovery.
  - ii) The request for a peer review will include the title and abstract of the paper and length, including number of figures. However, the **author's identity will not be revealed to the reviewer**. The request will also ask the potential reviewer to reveal any conflict of interest or mismatch of expertise based on the manuscript title and abstract. In the case of conference abstracts, reviewers should be given the title, and if necessary, a one- or two-sentence summary of the content. See attached request template (Appendix B). The majority of reviewers (at least half) should be selected by the editor apart from the suggested reviewer list provided by the author.
  - iii) In the event that the responsible editor becomes unable carry out this duty after being assigned (due to such as health problems, unforeseen employment duties, or determining that he or she is needed as a reviewer), he or she should contact the executive editor as soon as possible. The executive editor will reassign the paper to a new responsible editor and notify the author of the change in the editor handling the paper. If at all possible, such problems should be identified at the beginning of the editing process to prevent confusion resulting from shuffling the paper around to too many editors/reviewers.
  - iv) Also at this point, the editor will prepare transmittal of the manuscript to the reviewers by:
    - (1) Deleting the author's name and contact information from the text pages and file properties (In MS Word: Tools>Options>Security>Privacy Options>Remove personal information from file properties upon save). If possible, the file can be saved in RTF format, which will eliminate all electronic signatures of the author. This can distort figures, however, and may be deemed undesirable by the editor.
    - (2) Attaching this modified version of the paper/abstract to an e-mail cover letter to the reviewer. In the case of conference abstracts, they can be cut and pasted directly into the email text.
    - (3) Attaching a copy of the reviewer's guidelines (Appendix C) to the e-mail to the reviewer (Besides reviewer's detailed criticisms, the reviewer is asked to recommend either to accept as is, to accept with minor revision, to request major revision, or reject.)
    - (4) Thank the reviewer for willingness to review and request that the reviewer not sign or identify him- or herself other than in cover messages or letters to the editor (See Appendix C).

- (5) Indicate a suggested deadline for return of the review, see section f) below. (For articles: three to five weeks; for abstracts: two weeks)
  - (6) Generally, the editor should not initially ask reviewers to comment on specifics in the paper. A request to focus the review is appropriate depending on the reviewer's expertise or presuppositions. I.e., if it is a paper on the DNA comparisons in snakes, a herpetologist may be asked to focus on the handling of snake biology. Or the editor should ask a reviewer who is unsympathetic to creation biology to focus on such things as the quality of the techniques or knowledge of the research organisms and the literature rather than on the creation-based conclusions.
- v) If a reviewer fails to meet the suggested deadline, contact the reviewer and determine if the review will be completed in a reasonable time (e.g., two to four more weeks for article; one week for abstract). If not, begin trying to arrange for an alternate reviewer to review the paper.
  - vi) Upon return of reviews, acknowledge receipt with thank you message to reviewers.
  - vii) Carefully read reviews, the paper, and any notes made previously about the paper. Evaluate the degree to which the reviewers are negative or positive and note the significance of the specific criticisms and comments. Evaluate whether the reviewer was thorough and whether the comments reflect or suggest previous positive or negative interactions between the reviewer and author. Did the reviewers independently touch on points that had previously raised questions in your mind?
  - viii) In general, the following suggestions should be helpful in evaluating reviews in most cases.
    - (1) Two positive reviews: If both are thorough and address issues of concern to the editor's satisfaction, the reviews should be followed. If one or both are superficial, the editor can either query the reviewer(s) about particular points in the paper or seek a third review.
    - (2) Two negative reviews: As long as the reviews raise valid points and there is no reason to question the reviewer's qualifications or attitude toward the author, the recommendations of the reviewers should be followed. If one or both the reviews are superficial or seemingly biased, the editor may ask for clarification or seek a third reviewer.
    - (3) One positive and one negative review: All things being equal, especially if the reviewers recognize controversial issues not previously identified by the editor, a third review should be sought. If either or both reviews are superficial or biased, the editor should seek a third or possibly fourth reviewer.
    - (4) Upon receipt of the third or additional reviews, concurring critical reviews should be given more weight than positive reviews because the editorial goal is minimization of errors. It should become apparent with concurring negative reviews that the positive ones tended to gloss over problems. If two or more positive reviews concur in opposition to a single negative review, the editor should query the positive reviewer's specifically about issues raised by the negative reviewer **without** directly quoting or identifying the negative reviewer. If there is concurrence that the negative reviewer is incorrect about the issue, the positive reviews should be followed. Alternatively, one or more additional

reviews should be sought. With an increased number of reviews, it should become clear which reviewers are most knowledgeable and should be followed.

- (5) If the disagreements in multiple reviews stem from a truly unresolved scientific issue, the editor should decide whether the author has provided adequate evidence to address the scientific controversy. If two or more positive reviewers concur that the author has done so, the editor would be justified in publishing the paper over the objections of negative reviewers.
- ix) After weighing comments, the editor prepares an editor's evaluation based on a synthesis of advice from the reviewers. The overall judgment should be either to 1) accept the paper as is (this would be rare, as there is usually room for improvement), 2) accept the paper after minor to substantial revision, 3) suspend the acceptance/rejection pending receipt of major revisions, or, 4) if the flaws stem from the research design and/or are so catastrophic they can not be addressed in a revision, reject the paper. If revision is required, make very specific recommendations instructing the author how to correct the problem during revision. As the reviewers' remarks will be sent to the author, any sarcastic or inappropriately harsh remarks by a reviewer should be excised before the review is passed on to the author. Also, **the reviewers should not be identified to the authors**. This can be accomplished by cutting and pasting all reviewers' comments into a single document (See section c) iv) 4) above and Appendix C).
- d) Handling of Revision Process.
  - i) Send the author a cover letter along with the reviewers' comments and the editor's evaluation. If the review process leads to a negative evaluation, especially if the comments are harsh, cushion the blow with words of encouragement and remind the author this is not a personal attack. Offer to provide guidance (in addition to what you have already prepared) if the author must make major revision. If the paper is rejected, guidance for preparing an acceptable paper may be offered at the editor's discretion. Likewise, the editor may suggest an alternative journal to which the author may submit the paper. If the evaluation is to accept as is or with only minor revision, congratulate the author on the quality of the manuscript. Point out any format corrections that need to be made by the author before publication can proceed. Suggest deadline for revision process; see section f) below.
  - ii) Upon receipt of the revised manuscript, read the paper carefully, comparing with the editor's comments that were sent to the author.
  - iii) If the author fails to address the concerns of the editor by neither modifying the paper nor providing additional evidence and persuasion as to why the evaluation should not be followed, the author will need to be told politely to do so or the paper will be rejected.
  - iv) If the author submits privately solicited favorable reviews or comments in support of his or her position, the editor is under no obligation to consider these outside reviews.
  - v) If the author rebuts the editor's evaluation or reviewers' comments, the editor will need to decide whether the author's arguments are reasonable or whether yet other reviewers are needed to advise the editor. If so, the editor should keep the author informed of this added step.
  - vi) If major revision was requested, the revised manuscript may be so different from the original that additional reviews may need to be solicited. If so, the editor should keep the author informed of this added step.

- vii) Once the author submits a revised manuscript that addresses all of the editor's concerns to the editor's satisfaction and the editor has checked for compliance with standard format of the *OPBSG*, the author should be informed that the paper has been accepted for publication.
- viii) If at any time the author claims that the review process was unfair, inform the author that the evaluation of the paper may be appealed per the formal appeal process (see Section 6 below).
- e) Completion of editing process of successful paper.
  - i) The responsible editor should then transmit the accepted manuscript to the executive editor. The executive editor should never accept submission of a final paper directly from the author without the responsible editor's approval.
  - ii) The executive editor will supervise the preparation of the paper for publication. .
  - iii) The editor responsible for the review and revision process will be identified in the published paper at the end of the references.
  - iv) The executive editor will notify the author and responsible editor that the formatted paper is ready to be proofread. Both the author and responsible editor should proofread the paper and relay any changes to the executive editor. After the final changes are made the executive editor will publicly post the paper on the BSG website.
- f) Suggested deadlines and timeframes for completion of process (time for conference abstracts in parentheses)
  - i) Acknowledge receipt of submission: same day
  - ii) Determine suitability of submitted manuscript: 1 week (2 days after submission deadline)
  - iii) Editorial assignment: 2 weeks (3-4 days)
  - iv) Obtain reviewers: 1-2 weeks (2-3 days)
  - v) Transmittal of manuscript to reviewer: Same day as receive commitment from each reviewer
  - vi) Deadline for reviewer to return reviews: 3-5 weeks or longer depending on length of manuscript (2 weeks)
  - vii) Extension for failure of reviewer to meet deadline: 2-4 weeks (1 week)
  - viii) Acknowledge receipt of review: same day
  - ix) Decide status of manuscript and communicate evaluation to author: 1 week (1day)
  - x) Revision by author: variable depending on amount of additional research and rewriting is needed (maximum is 1 week before deadline to send to executive editor for formatting of conference proceedings)
  - xi) Editor's review of revised manuscript and decision about acceptance: 1-2 weeks (1 day), longer if there is disagreement and extended communication between author and editor.
  - xii) Transmittal of accepted manuscript to executive editor and preparation for publication: 1-2 weeks (2 days)
  - xiii) Proofreading and communication: 1-2 week (1 week, no later than 2 weeks prior to official publication of conference proceedings)
  - xiv) Final changes and publication: 1 week
- 2) Responsibilities
  - a) Executive Editor

- i) Appoint associate editors.
  - ii) Maintain lists and contact information of potential reviewers.
  - iii) Provide initial response to authors.
  - iv) Be available to write reviews.
  - v) Screen manuscript submissions for conformation to guidelines.
  - vi) Assign manuscripts to appropriate associate editors or self.
  - vii) Avoid conflict of interest in assigning editorial duties.
  - viii) Seek to minimize rejections by providing an editorial environment in which the editorial staff assists authors in improving papers based on advice from reviewers.
  - ix) Receive petitions from authors for formal appeals and convene an appeals panel. Serve on appeal panel as appropriate.
  - x) Oversee formatting of the accepted manuscripts for publication by a secretarial or technical staff person and oversee proofreading of formatted page proofs.
  - xi) Maintain records of all editorial correspondence with which he or she is directly involved.
  - xii) Keep editorial correspondence in confidence.
- b) Associate Editors
- i) Be available to write reviews.
  - ii) Handle review process of manuscripts assigned to them and make final decision on submitted papers.
  - iii) Notify executive editor of any potential conflicts of interest upon receiving notification of assignment.
  - iv) Conceal identity of author to reviewers and of reviewers to author and maintain confidentiality of editorial correspondence.
  - v) Communicate all outcomes of the review process with the authors. Do not privately conduct reviews that are not communicated with the author.
  - vi) Maintain records of all editorial correspondence with which he or she is directly involved.
  - vii) Serve on appeal panel.
- c) Authors
- i) Think and write as clearly and accurately as possible.
  - ii) Maintain emotional neutrality and skepticism toward their work and the manuscript
  - iii) Follow author and manuscript guidelines for *OPBSG* (Section 3 and Appendix A below).
  - iv) Obtain private reviews from friends and colleagues and revise manuscript before submission to *OPBSG*.
  - v) Make all revisions requested by editor who is responsible for the paper or prepare a respectful rebuttal as to why certain changes should not be made.
  - vi) Be willing to communicate with the responsible editor to facilitate a resolution to any disagreements that might arise.
- d) Reviewers
- i) Notify editor of potential conflict of interest.
  - ii) Evaluate their own qualifications and review only those papers for which they have sufficient expertise.

- iii) Thoroughly, honestly, and civilly critique overall logic and rationale, methods, results, and conclusions; point out problems with author's writing style and mechanics to editor.
  - iv) Keep the manuscript and editorial correspondence in confidence.
  - v) Promptly notify the editor if circumstances prevent him or her from reviewing the paper in a timely manner.
- 3) Guidelines for Authors
- a) Papers must conform to the manuscript guidelines of the *OPBSG*. See <http://www.bryancore.org/bsg/opbsg/opbsgguide.html> and Appendix A.
  - b) All work must be original contributions, either original research or interpretive reviews of the literature that are substantive. A substantive review would summarize past creationist or evolutionist contributions to a topic and suggest a new interpretation or proposal for research. Literature reviews should be comprehensive.
  - c) The submission should be a positive contribution to the creation model or, at least, a constructive criticism. Positive contributions to the creation model consider the history of creation as revealed in the Bible. That is, positive contributions contextualize their findings, results, and conclusions within the paradigm of Creation/Fall/Flood/Babel and/or a young earth or universe. Comparisons to or criticisms of evolution or other creationist theories are appropriate as long as they provide a creationist interpretation of data or a suggestion of such an interpretation. Papers that merely criticize evolution or argue for a "designer" do **not** conform to this criterion, but there are other creationist publications that would be interested in such work.
  - d) Papers must avoid *ad hominem* language of all kinds. Theories or scientists of opposing viewpoints must be treated with respect. Criticisms should be limited to identification and correction of errors.
  - e) Structure of Full Papers
    - i) Abstracts for all research, review, and concept papers are to be placed after the title and author and before the introduction. Abstracts should be no more than 250 words and succinctly summarize the methods, results, conclusions, and significance for the general topic. Authors should avoid including introductory remarks in such an abstract.
    - ii) Research papers must have an introduction (stating the previous work in the field, the reason for conducting the research, and the goal of the research reported in the paper), methods, results, discussion (what the results mean and how are they relevant), and conclusion (summary, significance of work, and future prospects), acknowledgments, and literature cited
    - iii) Papers that do not follow the standard research format (e.g., review, concept, theological, or other such papers), may be organized in a manner suitable to the topic or field of study. All papers must have an abstract, introduction, and references and must follow the referencing style prescribed in the manuscript guidelines (see Appendix A).
    - iv) Tables and figures are not to be inserted in the text but are to follow the literature cited and any appendices.
  - f) Structure of Conference abstracts. Abstracts are not to exceed 700 words **including references**. All conference abstracts must clearly summarize the entire paper. Introductory remarks may be included but should not exceed two or three sentences. A

composition that elaborates on the field's background or logic for the research, includes minimal methods, and concludes with statements such as "results will be presented and discussed" does **not** constitute an abstract and will be returned for immediate revision.

#### 4) Recommendations to authors

- a) Before writing the paper, authors should ask trusted colleagues to evaluate their research.
- b) Authors are encouraged to contact the executive editor early in the manuscript preparation to determine suitability for publishing in the *OPBSG*. If the author is inexperienced, the editor may offer to mentor or locate a mentor for the author to facilitate and improve the research and writing process. Open communication early in the preparation and editing will facilitate the paper's successful navigation through the editing process.
- c) Authors are encouraged to maintain humility toward their work and realize that everyone's work is improved by counsel from others with equal or greater expertise.
- d) Authors should not become emotionally attached to their work, which can easily become a source of sinful pride and a hindrance to teachability and communication.
- e) After the paper is written, trusted colleagues and close associates should be asked to read and critique the manuscript drafts for both scientific accuracy and readability.
- f) If the author believes the official reviews or editor's evaluation is in error, the author should quickly, effectively, respectfully, and professionally communicate this to the editor in accord with Matthew 18:15. Harboring and/or spitefully expressing negative feelings, especially to outside parties, and withdrawing a paper without attempting to resolve an issue with the editor will only lead to disunity in the Body of Christ.
- g) In a disagreement with an editor, do not submit personally solicited reviews to the editor in support of your position.
- h) In the event of a rejected paper, the author should determine from the editor if the paper can be salvaged, and if not, whether the paper might be published elsewhere. If the author is not satisfied with this advice, the appeal process (Section 6 below) should be invoked and strictly followed.

#### 5) Guidelines for Reviewers

- a) Guidelines to decide whether to accept review responsibilities—See Appendix B.
- b) Guidelines for reviewing a paper—See Appendix C.
- c) Review form—See Appendix D.

#### 6) Appeal Procedure

- a) Authors may petition appeals for both full papers and conference abstracts.
- b) The author petitions to convene the appeals panel with a written complaint and detailed explanation why evaluation by the responsible editor was biased, incompetent, or unethical. If the responsible editor is an associate editor, the author addresses the petition to the executive editor; if the executive editor was responsible for the review process, the author addresses the president of BSG. The complaint must be supported by proof of the accusation. Minimum standards of proof include among other things: 1) written communications, either to the author or to parties outside the editors and reviewers involved, from the editor that reveals his or her bias, 2) written evidence that the editor overlooked or concealed conflicts of interest, 3) positive reviews solicited by the author and written by competent researchers whose credentials can be compared to those of the reviewers solicited by the editor. **Failure to include minimum standards of proof** will result in the petition being denied.

- c) The appeal panel is convened and consists of the executive editor (if he or she was not the responsible editor) and the remaining associate editors. The appeal panel then will elect a chairman, not necessarily the executive editor. The chairman will handle all correspondence between the appeal committee and the appealing author. The author's statement and supporting documents are transmitted to the chairman.
  - d) The responsible editor prepares a statement in response to the accusations of the author and transmits this, along with the manuscript and all associated correspondence, to the chairman.
  - e) Each panel member is asked to read the originally submitted manuscript, any revised manuscript, the reviewers' comments, the responsible editor's evaluation, the author's statement and documents, and the responsible editor's statement.
  - f) The panel members will vote only on the question whether the editor issued a faulty decision. If the vote is in favor of the editor, the rejection is final. To publish the work in *OPBSG*, the author must address all problems, write a new paper and begin the submission process again. If the vote is against the editor, the appeal is upheld and the paper will be assigned to a different associate editor with whom the review process will be repeated. If the second review process ends in the paper being rejected again, no further appeal is possible.
- 7) Tenure of Editors and Accountability
- a) Selection and Tenure of Editors
    - i) The editorial board consists of the Executive Editor and five Associate Editors.
    - ii) Selection and tenure of the executive editor is subject to the bylaws of the BSG.
    - iii) The executive editor canvases potential qualified members of the BSG for their willingness to serve on the editorial board.
    - iv) Associate editors are then appointed by the Executive Editor.
    - v) Tenure of the associate editors is flexible. No term limits are currently set, but occasional rotation at the discretion of the executive editor will be exercised. The editors may continue duties indefinitely until that person requests to relinquish duties or until the executive editor requests the editor to rotate off the editorial board.
  - b) Evaluation and Replacement of Editors. In the event that executive or associate editors fail to perform their duties or a consistent pattern of unfair or incompetent editorial decisions develop, any of the editors can be removed and replaced.
    - i) Two appeal rulings against an associate editor will result in an editor's being removed from the editorial board. After two appeal rulings against the executive editor, (s)he will be replaced by the Executive Council according to the BSG bylaws.
    - ii) The performance of the editorial process will be reviewed each year by an evaluation survey to be held each year at the annual conference and included in the general conference survey.
    - iii) Generally, replacement of the associate editors is at the discretion of the executive editor. BSG members seeking replacement of an associate editor should submit written, signed complaints (which must include minimal standards of proof, as in Section 6 above) about the associate editors to the executive editor, who will solicit a response from the associate editor and evaluate past editorial decisions. Upon making a decision, the executive editor will notify the associate editor.
    - iv) Should the executive editor fail to perform the duties or fail to take action against an associate editor that should be replaced, the Executive Council should review the

- situation and remove executive editor. BSG members seeking to replace the executive editor should petition (as in step 7-b-iii above) the President of the BSG to convene the Executive Council to review the performance of the executive editor as per bylaws of the BSG.
- c) Reviewers are accountable to the responsible editor. If, in the opinion of the editor, the reviewer is judged to be incompetent, biased, untruthful, or incendiary, the editor is free to ignore the review, seek an alternate reviewer, and recommend striking the person from the standing list of potential reviewers.
  - d) Conflict of interest
    - i) Conflict of interest is an occasion when an editor, author, or reviewers may have competing interests in the publication of a work. All works submitted to *OPBSG* should be evaluated strictly on quality and suitability for publication. Any relationship between the editor, author, reviewers that might compromise the judgment of the paper's quality must be avoided.
    - ii) If at any point a conflict-of-interest develops or is discovered, the situation must be corrected. Either the paper must be reassigned to a different editor or the reviewer will be replaced with an alternate reviewer by the responsible editor. Interference by the author's employing institution to influence a positive editorial outcome will result in the immediate rejection of the paper.
    - iii) Conflict of interest would be caused by:
      - (1) For an editor—to be the author or co-author; to have the author as a co-worker; monetary gain due a particular editorial outcome.
      - (2) For a reviewer—to have competed with the author for grant funds on an identical or nearly identical project as the author is reporting; to be competing with the author on the completion and publication of an identical or nearly identical project regardless of whether the conclusions or similar or different; to have the author as a co-worker, tempting the reviewer to be untruthfully positive; monetary gain due a particular editorial outcome.
      - (3) Any attempt by employing institution of any of the parties, author, editor, or reviewer, to influence the editorial decision outside the procedures outlined in this manual constitutes a conflict of interest for that party.

## Appendix A. Manuscript Guidelines

### Manuscript Guidelines for *OPBSG*

1. *OPBSG* publishes peer-reviewed, original research or review papers of relevance to creation biology. *OPBSG* is committed to constructive scientific research in creation biology; manuscripts that are primarily critiques of evolution will be referred to a more appropriate publication.
2. Manuscripts may be of any length but should cover the topic in sufficient detail as determined by the editor. Because the electronic publication format is less constrained than traditional print journals, authors are encouraged to include raw data and extensive diagrams where appropriate. Shorter papers, such as student projects, are also strongly encouraged.
3. Manuscripts should be double-spaced in 12-point Times font. Figures and tables should be included at the end of the manuscript, preceded by a separate section of figure and table legends. Do not integrate figures or legends directly into the text. Title page should include the following items (in order): The title of the paper, the names and affiliations of all authors, and contact information (mailing address, email, phone and FAX number) for the corresponding author. All papers (reviews and research papers) must include an abstract of 250 words or less. References should be made by author-date parenthetical notation and listed alphabetically at the end of the paper (before the figure/table legends). References to books must include pages (e.g. Marsh 1941, p. 100). References should be in the following format:

**Journal article:**

Robinson, D.A. and D.P. Cavanaugh. 1998. Evidence for a holobaraminic origin of the cats. *CRSQ* 35:2-14.

**Journal article with many authors:**

Venter, J.C., and 272 others. 2001. The sequence of the human genome. *Science* 291:1304-1351.

**Book:**

Marsh, F.L. 1947. *Evolution, Creation, and Science*, 2nd ed. Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D.C.

**Book Chapter:**

Hartwig-Scherer, S. 1998. Apes or ancestors? Interpretations of the hominid fossil record within evolutionary and basic type biology. In: Dembski, W.A., ed. *Mere Creation*. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL, pp. 212-235.

**Internet article or resource:**

BSG: A Creation Biology Study Group. 2006. *Software & Databases*. Retrieved November 14, 2007, from <http://www.bryancore.org/bsg/bdist.html>

4. All manuscripts must be submitted electronically to [opbsgeditor@bryancore.org](mailto:opbsgeditor@bryancore.org) in one of the following formats: Word, WordPerfect, PDF, or RTF.

## Appendix B. Template of letter to request review.

Dear:

Would you consider reviewing a manuscript submitted for publication in the on-line journal, *OCCASIONAL PAPERS OF THE BSG*? The abstract of the paper, "*TITLE*," is attached. The paper consists of XX pages plus XX figures. Should you be willing to review the paper, please let me know at your earliest convenience whether this paper appears to pose a conflict-of-interest for you. If you agree to review the paper, I would appreciate receiving your comments within 3--5 weeks from time of receipt. If other obligations prevent you from serving or the subject matter is outside your expertise, can you suggest possible reviewers? Any help you can provide will be most appreciated.

If you are unfamiliar with the journal and the organization, please refer to our web site listed below. If you are not sympathetic with the presuppositions or interpretive framework of the BSG, let me assure you that I value your expertise with the study organisms and/or research techniques. Furthermore, it is expected that *OPBSG* will publish papers in which the author reinterprets some data that was originally collected and published by evolutionary biologists, but *OPBSG* desires to avoid misinterpreting or misquoting the conclusions of those biologists. As you are likely to know those authors and their work, your assistance in catching such errors will be very much appreciated. *OPBSG* does not publish lists of reviewers.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name

Associate Editor, OPBSG

<http://www.bryancore.org/bsg/>

## Appendix C. Template of Guide to Reviewers

### Guidelines for Reviewers

Thank you for agreeing to review an article for *OPBSG*. The BSG appreciates your willingness to help us improve the quality and accuracy of our publications. After reading the article submitted to the *OPBSG*, if you should realize that reviewing it presents a conflict-of-interest, please contact the editor before preparing a review.

When making your recommendation and remarks, would you please keep these questions in mind?

1. Does the paper make a contribution to creation biology that is not published elsewhere?
2. Is the paper logically consistent within its presuppositional framework?
3. Was the research protocol or data analysis performed correctly?
4. Is the author(s) adequately familiar with the research organisms? What sorts of problems suggest that the author(s) is not?
5. Is every part of the paper, including figures and tables, needed to clarify the thesis?
6. Is anything missing, such as adequate documentation of research specimens or references to previously published data?
7. Are all figures and tables clear and understandable? Are labels and/or legends adequate?
8. Are references to and quotations of other authors accurate and in context?
9. Are there outstanding problems with English composition? NOTE: Suggestions for minor corrections can be made directly on the manuscript.
10. Is the use of terminology or phrases correct, especially if references are made to organisms or methods outside the author's area of expertise?

Please keep the manuscript and your review in confidence. Please do not pass the manuscript on to a colleague to review. Rather notify the editor about the colleague as another potential reviewer whom the editor will contact. If you return the review as hard copy by post, please sign only your cover letter.

**Appendix D. Template for Reviewers' form**

**MANUSCRIPT TITLE:**

**MANUSCRIPT RECEIVED:**

**NO. OF PAGES:**

**NO. OF FIGURES:**

*Reviewer Number:*

As reviewer, your identity will not be revealed to the author(s).

Recommendation:

Check one:

- Accept for publication without revision \_\_\_\_\_
- Accept for publication with minor to significant revisions \_\_\_\_\_
- Suspend consideration pending receipt of major revisions \_\_\_\_\_
- Reject \_\_\_\_\_

**REMARKS (Please attach additional pages, as needed):**