

*EvoS: The Journal of the Evolutionary Studies Consortium (EvoS Journal)*  
Instructions for Undergraduate Reviewers of Manuscripts

**Aim and Scope of EvoS**

The aim of *EvoS Journal* is to promote the education of evolutionary theory in colleges and universities. *EvoS Journal* welcomes work from all academic disciplines as well as interdisciplinary scholarship that incorporates evolutionary theory across areas of study. For example, an evolutionary approach to a problem that has previously been labeled strictly psychological or sociological would be an interdisciplinary paper. The undergraduate portion of the journal provides high-quality examples of student work that represents the EvoS or EvoS related experience for undergraduate students. As such, we welcome both research reports and theoretical contributions, briefly described as follows:

- *Research Reports.* These papers are reports of original empirical research. Any papers connected to evolutionary theory are welcome. These may be, for instance, revised versions of research reports that present original data in the areas of evolutionary anthropology, biology, literary studies, or psychology.
- *Theoretical/Review Contributions.* These papers summarize theoretical issues tied to evolutionary theory and/or review a relevant body of literature connected to evolutionary studies in a coherent fashion. Examples of such manuscripts that would be considered include a summary of the evolution of language, a review of research on some aspect of early hominid evolution, a coherent summary of different approaches to understanding the evolution of religion, etc. Topics within any academic area – connected by the thread of evolutionary theory – are acceptable.

The specific instructions provided below are meant as guidelines for reviewing a manuscript submitted to *EvoS Journal*. Reviewers may feel free to write reviews in paragraph form, rather than bulleted answers to each point below. However, please DO NOT write comments within the text of the manuscript. The ideas and methods of manuscripts are under review. If there are “local” errors, such as grammatical mistakes, please comment on that and point out a few.

**Specific Instructions for Reviewers**

1. Your recommendation: please choose one of the following recommendations and a brief reason why.
  - a. **Accept** (typically given if the manuscript is a good fit with the aim of *EvoS* and there are no changes needed before the paper is ready for publication).
  - b. **Accept after Revisions** (typically given if the manuscript is a good fit with the aim of *EvoS* and there are only minor changes needed before the paper is ready for publication).
  - c. **Revise and Resubmit** (typically given if the manuscript is a good fit with the aim of *EvoS* but there are a number of changes needed before the paper is ready for publication).

- d. **Reject** (typically the decision given if the manuscript doesn't fit with the aim of *EvoS* or the research/theory is too flawed to be fixed).
2. Qualitative analysis of the manuscript text: Please answer the following questions or write a brief review summary:
- a. Does this manuscript fit within the aim and scope of *EvoS Journal*? (see above)
  - b. Did you learn something new from this manuscript?
  - c. Could you summarize the main point of the manuscript?
  - d. Does the manuscript contribute new information or a new perspective on an old argument?
  - e. If a Research Report:
    - i. Do the conceptual links between the theoretical arguments and empirical proof match? If not, what specifically is the problem?
    - ii. Are the statistics and method used appropriate? (if you are unsure, you may want to ask your faculty advisor for help).
  - f. Is the manuscript clear, concise, and understandable?
  - g. Does the manuscript have a meaningful conclusion?
  - h. Is the manuscript primarily written in the author's voice? This means no more than 4-5 quotes throughout the paper (only when necessary)
  - i. Would you suggest any changes in the structure of the ms?
  - j. Any additional comments? (you might include comments about spelling/grammatical mistakes or content comments that aren't covered with the other questions).

\*Please be cordial in your reviews. Imagine that you are to receive the same comments for one of your own papers, and treat the author(s) respectfully. For an example, please see the sample review below.

Sample **Revise and Resubmit** Review of a *Theoretical/Review Contribution*  
for *EvoS Journal*

Article Title: Is Jealousy and Evolved Trait?

Decision: Revise and Resubmit

Summary: In general, this manuscript is well-written and within the aims of *EvoS*. I enjoyed reading it, and believe that it could have an impact on future evolutionary research. There were some important articles not cited by this manuscript, some grammatical mistakes, and the conclusion appears incomplete. Therefore, I recommend that the manuscript be revised and resubmitted.

Qualitative Analysis:

This manuscript takes to task the jealousy literature in evolutionary psychology. There have been many studies, both complementary and contradictory, to test whether jealousy is an evolved trait. This particular manuscript aims to compare the articles to determine whether the evidence supports jealousy as an evolved trait, and suggest future research. Thus, this article does not provide any new data on the evolutionary origins of human jealousy; rather, it summarizes existing studies on this topic in an effort to paint a portrait of the findings in this research area.

The introduction summarizes many of the pertinent studies in jealousy research, including pieces testing the forced-choice method to test sex differences, Likert-scale ratings designed to evaluate one's perception of emotional v. sexual infidelity, and physiological studies. Considering the issue of universality important to evolutionary research, I found that cross-cultural studies were conspicuously missing. The issue of cross-cultural research needs to be addressed in much more detail. Further, I am aware of a study that examines the effects of vivid imagination on sex differences in jealousy that is absent (Strout, Laird, Shafer, & Thompson, 2005). Without including this article and the cross-cultural literature in the introduction, I feel the paper is incomplete.

The conclusion is firm in stating that whether or not jealousy is an evolved trait cannot be evaluated at this time. However, as outlined by Schmitt and Pilcher (2004), one method for evaluating a potential adaptation is by collecting pieces of evidence from many areas of research (e.g., primate studies, cross-cultural studies, physiological research). Perhaps with some reflection on this approach, or another reputed methodology, as well as incorporating the missing literatures mentioned above, the conclusion might offer a stronger perspective on jealousy. The manuscript's bottom line is encapsulated in this line from page 14: "Clearly, data on this topic are mixed and the scientific world is not yet ready to comment on whether human jealousy evolved via biological evolution." While this point partly matches analysis that precedes it, the lack of a systematic approach to examining whether jealousy is an adaptation (as per Schmitt and Pilcher's article) dovetailed with the omission of all cross-cultural data on this topic make this neutral conclusion seem a bit premature.

There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript that could be fixed with grammar check. I haven't corrected them, but for example, on page 3 there is a sentence, "Johnson & Willis (2004) **finded** that sex differences in jealousy exist primarily amongst college-aged students." Further, the references are not all in APA style.

The manuscript itself is clearly written and well-organized. If the authors broaden their literature search and review, as well as choose a paradigm and/or more systematic method by which to evaluate jealousy as an evolved trait, I feel this manuscript would be an excellent fit with *EvoS Journal*.

#### References

- Schmitt, D. P., & Pilcher, J. J. (2004). Evaluating evidence of psychological adaptation: How do we know one when we see one? *Psychological Science*, *15*(10), 643-649.
- Strout, S. L., Laird, J. D., Shafer, A., & Thompson, N. S. (2005). The effect of vividness of experience on sex differences in jealousy. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *3*, 263-274.