

## **COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE Publication Review Guidelines**

The Cooperative Extension Service has established the following publication review guidelines to assist authors and administrators in reviewing manuscripts for publication through University Communications. These guidelines are to serve as suggested processes and are not meant to be taken as policy. Through consultation between authors and appropriate administrators, a different review process may be used for some publications. Administrator-approved deviation from these guidelines is acceptable as long as a critical review of the manuscript takes place before submission of the manuscript to University Communications for editing.

Any New Mexico State University employee may write a Cooperative Extension Publication. Employees without official CES appointments are encouraged to co-author publications with CES employees. Publication collaboration between Extension Specialists and County Agents is also strongly encouraged.

Extension guides and circulars contain information that, while it may be research-based, is primarily designed to inform or instruct the public. These publications are reviewed every five years by the author or appropriate specialist to ensure that their content is still valid and up-to-date. If an author is considering producing a publication that reports on completed research results or that is more technical or in-depth than a typical CES publication, that author may wish to consider publishing through the Agricultural Experiment Station.

### Guidelines for New Publications:

1. After the manuscript is written, the author (first author for co-authored publications) submits an electronic copy of the manuscript to their CES department head along with recommendations for three reviewers – one internal peer (NMSU), one external peer (outside of NMSU) and one intended audience reviewer. If the author(s) does not have an official extension appointment, the manuscript must be submitted to the appropriate CES department head considering the subject matter of the manuscript. Administrators must approve selected reviewers or make suggestions for other reviewers. Water Task Force publications should be submitted in the same manner to the Water Task Force Coordinator. Authors wishing to publish Range Improvement Task Force publications or New Mexico Chile Association publications should contact the appropriate Administrator for review process information.
2. Once reviewers are agreed upon, CES department heads contact the reviewers and ask of their willingness to review the manuscript. Authors should provide reviewers with an electronic copy of the manuscript, an electronic copy of the CES Publication Review Form, and a timeline for the review process. If selected reviewers are unwilling or unable to review the manuscript in an appropriate time frame, the author should consult with their Administrator and select a substitutereviewer.
3. Reviewers return their comments, including a completed CES PublicationReview Form, to the Department Head who will make the final decision to continue with the process.
4. Based on the reviewer's comments, authors make appropriate changes to the manuscript and submit the revised manuscript along with the reviewer's comments to their Administrator. If the author decides not to make suggested changes, an explanation for this decision should be submitted to the Administrator along with the

revised manuscript.

5. Administrators review the publication (and the reviewer's comments).
6. If additional changes need to be made, the manuscript is returned to the author for corrections.
7. If manuscript is approved as submitted, the Administrator submits a copy of the manuscript along with a signed Manuscript Approval Form to University Communications.

Guidelines for Revised Publications:

1. The review process for revised publications is negotiable between authors and an appropriate Administrator.
2. If only minor changes have been made, it may be determined that no further review is needed.
3. If significant changes have been made, it may be determined that the manuscript should be reviewed according to the guidelines set forth for new publications.

Approved March 2009; Revised February 2018