

Instructions for Referees

1. Purpose of the Referee's report

The Referee's report is essential to the editorial process. Your suggestions will have a major influence on our decisions and the author will benefit from your critical comments.

2. Anonymity

Your comments and suggestions will be used anonymously unless you explicitly state that you wish to reveal your identity. Correspondingly, the Author's manuscript should be treated as confidential.

3. Structure of the Referee's report

Your report should be in three parts:

- i. A **Report to the Editor** recommending the action to be taken with regard to the manuscript, reasons for that, and any other comments for the Editor (but not for the Author).
- ii. **Comments for the Author**, which will be forwarded by the Editor to the author. Include the name of the author and the title of the manuscript, but not your own name or any other information that could identify you.
- iii. The completed **Checklist for Referees** (intended for the Editor only and not to be shown to the Author). See Evaluation outcomes, below.

The content of (i) and (ii) may be similar in content – and normally will be, given that they are about the same manuscript – but the latter one should **not** include your recommendations to the Editor.

The main purpose of the Comments for the Author is to inform the author as clearly as possible of your critical points and suggestions. If the manuscript has potential, try to encourage the author to revise it. In that case, you should in particular specify clearly whatever revisions you find necessary. On the other hand, it is useless to encourage an author to try to make something out of nothing.

We encourage you to create Comments for the Author as a separate file (.doc, .docx, or .pdf type) and submit it through the system when completing your evaluation.

4. Language of the Referee's report

The Referee's report should be in English.

Thank you very much for your collaboration,

Ingegerd Jansson, PhD
Annica Isaksson, PhD
Co-Editors-in-Chief, *Journal of Official Statistics*

Evaluation Outcomes

After evaluation, a manuscript is accorded one of five decisions:

Acceptance (A). The manuscript is of sufficient quality and is accepted for publication without any need for revision.

Minor Revision (MiR). The manuscript is of sufficient quality but some minor revisions need to be made regarding content, structure, presentation, or formalia. The manuscript meets the criteria for a publishable scientific contribution and is accepted for publication conditional on the author's satisfactorily addressing the issues raised by the referees and the Associate Editor.

Major Revision (MaR). The manuscript is of sufficient quality but it requires clarification, rewriting, reorganization, cutting, more detailed explanation of certain points, and so on. The manuscript meets the criteria for a publishable scientific contribution and is accepted for publication conditional on the author's satisfactorily addressing the issues raised by the referees and the Associate Editor.

Reject and Resubmit (RR). The manuscript is promising but needs major revisions. *JOS* encourages revisions being made and will be happy to receive a revision, which will be subject to a new round of evaluation.

Reject (R). The manuscript is not accepted for publication.