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**Guidelines for Refereeing**

JIBLM is unique to other journals both in the content that it publishes and in the requests it makes of authors. Hence, the requests JIBLM makes of referees are also unique and for this reason we outline this process. It may be helpful to refer to the Information for Authors at [www.jiblm.org](http://www.jiblm.org) authors.html.

JIBLM requests that authors submit only notes that adhere to an inquiry-based learning pedagogy. These notes should have been thoroughly class tested and provide a successful course in their present formulation. We ask that you read the guide carefully in an effort to validate that this course has been used and would be effective in a one-semester course. Such a guide should be error free, mathematically sound, and effective at the type of institution described in the author's introduction. Unlike a research paper, a course guide does not have solutions and proofs for a referee to read. We leave to the judgment of our referees the extent to which they will work the problems and prove the theorems on their own. In the end we ask that they send us a report that answers several questions.

1. Do these notes adhere to an inquiry-based pedagogy?
2. Is this a well written manuscript which would, after any necessary revisions, constitute ``a carefully crafted course guide?"
3. Does the manuscript contain sufficient material for at least a full semester course?
4. Does the introduction include an adequate description of the course that was taught and how this manuscript was used to teach it?
5. Does the introduction indicate the course's level and role within the broader curriculum?
6. Does the introduction provide sufficient guidance for a less experienced instructor who uses these notes?
7. What, if any, specific revisions or corrections would you recommend?
8. Which do you recommend: acceptance, rejection or acceptance pending revision?