

## **Types of Articles**

**Research Articles/Findings** describe research based work guided by a theoretical foundation that contributes significantly new scholarship by advancing new theory or knowledge for transforming practice on the relationships between society and natural resources. Empirically based articles should have a clearly described sound methodology/research design and a well-developed data analysis section. Articles should not exceed 8,500 words, including all references, notes, tables and figures.

**Review Articles** are stand-alone publications with a robust methods section on how literature was selected and analysed, which provide a comprehensive appraisal of scientific research and/or policy in the targeted field. We encourage critical review articles with a clear rationale and objective for all topics addressed by SNR. We especially welcome reviews concentrating on the four topical foci of SNR: 1. Protected area management and governance; 2. Stakeholder analysis, consultation and engagement; deliberation processes; governance; conflict resolution; social learning; social impact assessment; 3. Theoretical frameworks, epistemological issues, and methodological perspectives; 4. Multiscalar character of social implications of natural resource management. We also welcome reviews in English of literature written in a different language. Total maximum length including tables, figures, references and notes should not exceed 8,500 words.

**Practice-Based Knowledge** articles provide lessons learned from practitioners and academics working alone or together. Rather than attempting to test a hypothesis or establish new theory, what distinguishes practice-based articles is that they ground new insights into interactions between society and natural resources in particular places and actions, and provide clear descriptions of both the context and arrangements under which the work was conducted and what constitutes the data or evidence behind their assertions. We encourage submissions that reflect on why decisions, approaches to problem solving, practices, and ideas worked or did not work and how those lessons might be applicable to other contexts. Authors should be explicit and clear as to their positions and roles in the places or actions being described. Total maximum length including tables, figures, references and notes should not exceed 5000 words.

**Policy Reviews/Analyses** examine current or proposed policies associated with social dynamics related to natural resource management. These articles can raise questions of policy, propose alternate action, or critique current or proposed policy. Total maximum length including tables, figures, references and notes should not exceed 5,000 words.

**Comments/Rejoinders** offer a forum where authors can present editorial remarks and their perspectives and observations about social behavior, natural resources, and the environment. These comments may be derived from the author's particular disciplinary orientation, previous experiences, and the like. Such observations might focus on similarities or differences (and the likely bases for these) in the nature of problems, institutions, or social processes they have encountered. This forum is also the place for editorial or professional reaction to published material in the journal. Total maximum length including tables, figures, references and notes should not exceed 3,000 words.

A **Research Note** is a short article on an innovative methodological or other aspect of the research process employed to study the relationship of social behavior, natural resources, and the environment. In particular a research note should clearly state the kind of contribution the author(s) want to make to the research methods/design in the field, advance a solid argument in favor of a particular methodology or approach, clarify an important methodological or design issue, and/or bring a novel methodological problem to the attention of the journal's

readers. Total maximum length including tables, figures, references and notes should not exceed 3,000 words.

All parts of the manuscript should be typewritten, double-spaced with 12-point font and with margins of at least one inch on all sides. All content, including abstracts, footnotes, appendices, and references should be double-spaced. There is no minimum length so long as the article sufficiently fulfills the criteria for that article type; maximum manuscript length varies by type of article:

- General Research Articles: 8,500 words
- Review Articles: 8,500 words
- Practice-Based Knowledge: 5,000 words
- Policy Reviews/Analyses: 5,000 words
- Comments/Rejoinders: 3,000 words
- Research Notes: 3,000 words

*Word limits include all references, notes, tables, appendices, and figures.* Word limits do not include the title page, abstract, and keywords. Each figure is equivalent to about 300 words (2 figures equal 600 words, and so on). Please keep the length of your manuscript at these limits. The abstract should not exceed 150 words. Please include 5-10 alphabetized keywords

Please Note: Manuscripts that exceed the length limits will be returned without review.

### **Book Reviews:**

Reviews are solicited, and may include reviews of videos and films, as well as traditional book reviews and review essays. Please contact the Book Review Editor for unsolicited book reviews or suggestions for future reviews. Reviews should focus on current social science research and thinking on the interaction of social and biophysical processes, policies and practices occurring around the world and at multiple scales. Selection of unsolicited review submissions is at the judgement of the Review Editor, in consultation with the Editors-in-Chief, if appropriate. The target length for reviews is generally 500-1000 words. Occasionally, longer review essays of 1500-2000 words will be considered.

Society & Natural Resources receives review submissions electronically via the ScholarOne manuscript management system, at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/usnr>. See Instructions for authors for detailed instructions.

Reviews should be written by scholars or practitioners holding a PhD (or equivalent) in a related field. Current students may co-author a review with a PhD-level collaborator. Reviews should be written by scholars or practitioners without biases or conflicts of interest with respect to the subject of the review. Conflicts of interest exist where the prospective reviewer has one or more interests or relationships that could affect the objectivity of the review. Close colleagues, co-authors, current and former advisees, relatives, etc., would be considered to have conflicts of interest, as would potential detractors involved in a scientific debates.

Inquiries should be directed to [snr@iasnr.org](mailto:snr@iasnr.org).