

1 Suggested Book Review Process

1. First, skim the book and decide which of the following it warrants:
 - (a) No Review. In this case, keep the book or pass it on.
 - (b) A Telegraphic Review. This is a very short review; see a recent issue of *JASA* for examples. Realize that only *JASA/TAS* are eligible to write telegraphic reviews...you will incur this writing burden. This said, telegraphic reviews are usually very easy to write due to shortness.
 - (c) A Regular (Full) Review. In the L^AT_EX Review Template, full reviews are categorized by length: short (1–2 pages), medium (3–4 pages), and long (5–6 pages).

The reviews section does have a page limit. Only very influential books should be recommended for long reviews. In such cases, it may be preferable to solicit two shorter reviews, one by a layman and one by an expert. New editions of previously published books typically receive only telegraphic reviews.

2. Check the Editor's *TAS* versus *JASA* recommendation. Do you disagree? Books whose only niche resides in teaching belong in *TAS*.
3. If a full review is indicated, do the following:

- (a) Identify an appropriate reviewer. For inspiration, you may
 - Consult the book's bibliography
 - Search Current Index to Statistics, Google Scholar, JSTOR, etc.
 - Search web pages of good departments to find people with compatible research areas or teaching assignments (faculty who have taught from the text usually make great reviewers).

Subjectwise, you have leeway in soliciting reviewers. If you match the reviewer and book's subject too closely, conflicts over minor issues often are evident. The reverse scenario can yield an uninformative review — you wouldn't want to contact a probabilist to review a linear models text or vice versa.

Be aware of potential conflicts of interest (e.g., an undergraduate textbook in time-series analysis should not be reviewed by an author of such a text if it is still in print and being used).

- (b) Send an e-mail or call your potential reviewer. Remind the person that while reviews probably don't "count" the same as research articles, they are read and appreciated by many; moreover, the reviewer gets to keep the book! Occasionally the reviewer will ask to see the book first. In this event, insist on a deadline (two weeks?) so that there is time to identify an alternative reviewer if need be.
- (c) Send the book along with a letter of instructions and the "Guidelines for JASA/TAS Reviewers". Be sure to state your suggested length in the letter to avoid any possible misunderstanding later on. Give a clear deadline (typically 2–3 months). Be realistic here. It takes time to evaluate a book, but on the other hand, a book review loses value if it lags the book's publication by years. We do want reviewers to read books carefully; however, it is not always necessary to read every word. If the reviewer is dragging with the review, remind them that waiting a short while for an informative review is not overly problematic, whereas waiting six months for an uninformative review is.

Encourage the reviewer to submit the review to you electronically and to use the L^AT_EX Review Template. If the reviewer does not want to use L^AT_EX, the next best choice is plain ASCII text. If they use Word (or similar), please have the reviewer save it as a .txt type file (or you can do it yourself if you have the capability).

- (d) Send an email reminder shortly before the review is due. Whereas most hate to be ‘bugged’, human nature is to respond to the loudest screamer.
- (e) Read the review to ensure that the reviewer has followed recommended guidelines. **You have license to edit without contacting me.** If the review is superficial, crass, or there are parts that are unclear, contact the reviewer to correct the problem.
- (f) Send the review as an e-mail attachment to jasa-reviews@iastate.edu. This may change soon to have you upload the review to the website.
- (g) Send the reviewer a thank-you note for their services. This is important.

2 *JASA/TAS* Deadlines

The *JASA/TAS* production process takes about 5 to 6 months from the manuscript-approved stage to the print copy arriving in subscribers’ mailboxes. Since *JASA* and *TAS* are published quarterly, there can be up to three additional months’ delay. So it is good to set your reviewers’ deadlines at least 2–3 weeks before a production deadline to allow time for tardiness, your perusal, and the Editor’s final review. The production deadlines are approximately the following:

March 1 for August *TAS*, September *JASA*

June 1 for November *TAS*, December *JASA*

September 1 for February *TAS*, March *JASA*

December 1 for May *TAS*, June *JASA*