



Complex Systems Toolkit: Guidance for Reviewing Guidance Articles

Thank you for reviewing a contribution to the Complex Systems Toolkit. This document will help to guide you through the review process. If you have any questions, please email Wendy Attwell at w.attwell@epc.ac.uk

Reviewer expectations

What you can expect as a [Complex Systems Toolkit](#) content reviewer:

- That we will treat you as the professional and subject matter expert that you are.
- That we will not ask you to review an unreasonable amount of content (our expectation is that this will not exceed two or three pieces of content per year).
- That we will be clear about your assignments and deadlines.
- That, once you have completed your first review assignment, we will recognise your academic citizenship by adding your bio and photo to our [Contributors page](#).

What we expect from you:

- That you will act professionally within this role and bring your expertise to the table when reviewing content.
- That you will follow the applicable reviewer guidance document(s).
- That you will ask us for support if you feel that the content of the review assignment lies outside of your expertise.
- That you will abide by any applicable rules, regulations or laws, including those regarding privacy and data protection.
- That you will maintain confidentiality about the content of the review assignment until it is published.
- That you will work to agreed deadlines once you have accepted a review assignment.

Guidance for reviewers

This toolkit provides resources and guidance for the teaching of complex systems in engineering, spanning socio-technical, environmental, economic and policy dimensions, and the tools used to analyse, model or understand them.

- Each contribution type has distinct expectations which you can learn about in this guidance.
- After each section, questions are posed for you to consider in relation to the contribution.
- On the contribution, please use “track changes” and comments to make suggestions related to each question (as required) that can guide the author in revisions.
- Aim to summarise your thoughts on the overall contribution and how much (if any) further work it needs from the author.
- Return the contribution in Word (.doc or .docx) or equivalent format to Wendy Attwell w.attwell@epc.ac.uk
- If you prefer not to be contacted by the author to discuss your review, please let us know in advance.

Guidance articles

Guidance articles are resources that users can access to learn how to do something. These are intended to provide practical advice on subjects such as how to explain complex systems to students, or how to assess for skills and competencies in complex systems. While knowledge articles focus on “what”, guidance articles should focus on “how.”

Before you begin, you should review guidance articles that form a part of the EPC’s [Sustainability Toolkit](#), since we hope that contributions to the Complex Systems Toolkit will be fairly consistent in length, style, and tone.

Guidance articles aim to help situate our teaching resources in an educational context and to signpost to additional research and resources on complex systems theory and tools.

They should be approximately 500-1000 words (although they can be more in depth if necessary) and reference relevant online open-source resources.

Overview

- The articles are meant to be able to stand on their own as a piece of guidance on a topic; they are also meant to work alongside other articles so that taken together they form a sort of complex systems in engineering handbook.
 - Does the article both make sense as a single piece of guidance as well as fit in with the rest of the articles to be developed?

Purpose

- Each article should inform, explain, and provide knowledge on the topics. Put yourself in the perspective of an engineering educator who is new to complex systems.
 - Can you understand the information presented and would it help you?
 - Would someone new to complex systems understand the information presented and would it help them?

Content

- The content of the article should be organised and well developed. That is, it should be presented in a logical way and thoroughly explained.
 - Is the explanation clear, logically structured and technically accurate?
 - Does the author need to expand on any ideas or reorganise them to make them clearer?

References & resources

- Where additional explanation could be given, it might point to other resources, and where information is presented from another source, it needs to be properly referenced.
 - Are sources cited using [Harvard referencing](#)?
 - Are open resources or links to other toolkit materials included?
 - What additional resources or references should the author include?

Format

- Does the article follow this format?:
 - Premise;
 - Body of article, divided up into headed sections as necessary;
 - Conclusion (optional);
 - References: use [Harvard referencing](#);
 - Resources (online and open source).

Suggestions

- Provide any further suggestions or guidance that you think would help the author(s) improve the article.
 - Have you included comments and/or tracked changes feedback for clarity, depth or reorganisation?
 - Have you flagged up anything that's missing?
 - Have you summarised your thoughts on the overall contribution and how much (if any) further work it needs from the author?

Corrections

- If possible, aim to correct any spelling, grammar, or punctuation mistakes as you review, but remember that editing, proofreading and formatting are the next stage of the process.

Returning the reviewed article

- Return the contribution in Word (.doc or .docx) or equivalent format to Wendy Attwell w.attwell@epc.ac.uk