

### Revision Guidelines

In addressing the enclosed readers' comments please use the following guidelines:

- If you think that a reader has misunderstood your purpose, this may mean that you have not been sufficiently clear about your objectives.
- Where a reader asks you to do things/consult materials that are beyond the scope of your concerns, try to build into your essay some indication that you are aware of these possibilities and some explanation about why you have chosen not to pursue these directions.
- Where a reader's criticisms seem to stem from ideological differences, you do not need to "change your colours" – *Mosaic* does not have any "party line" – but you should somehow indicate that you are aware of different perspectives, and you should also consider whether these criticisms do indeed point to weak spots in your argument.
- If a reader has reservations about the interdisciplinary component or theoretical framework of your essay, try to make clearer how your essay does have such a framing context, and where necessary provide further grounding or contextualization.
- Where readers seem to disagree and to offer opposing recommendations for revisions, use the above strategies as a way of attempting to accommodate these different perspectives.
- In cases where major revisions are required, we may return the resubmission to one or more of the original evaluators; where the revisions are minor or technical, we will make the decision in-house.
- In preparing your revision, please follow *Mosaic* guidelines as to *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing* format, consulting our Author Guidelines in all cases.
- When returning your essay, please briefly explain in a covering letter the nature of the revisions you have made or do not wish to make.

**Please return to:**

Dawne McCance, Editor

Mosaic\_Submissions@umanitoba.ca