These are the guidelines for nonfiction reviews for SFRA Review, current as of August 2019. Past issues of the Review are available at https://sfra.wildapricot.org/SFRA-Review.

The Review regularly solicits reviews through the SFRA mailing list and through SFRA’s social media platforms. Please to not submit unsolicited reviews. Any requests or suggestions of nonfiction works for review should be made directly to the nonfiction review editor and assistant review editor above. If you think you’d be a good reviewer for a particular text, send an email stating your interest as well as why you’d be the best choice to review it, and we’ll send you the book for review along with a deadline.

All commissioned reviews should follow basic MLA Guidelines including: 1-inch margins, double-spaced text, 12 pt. Times New Roman font, and appropriate referencing.

In addition, all commissioned reviews should contain the following information at the top of the first page:

- Review text’s title (shortened) in bold (centered)
- Reviewer’s name as it should appear in print (centered)
- Complete citation of the review text as per MLA guidelines (left justified)
  - Per examples below, please include the following, each separated by a period: Format (Hardcover, Paperback, Ebook), page count, price, ISBN.

Examples:

**Speculative Fiction and Queer Possibility**

Jane Doe


**Afrofuturism Rising**

Janine Doe


**Content and Structure**

1. Description: Provide a brief description of the text. Note, however, that although the review should provide this brief synopsis, its focus should be the larger intellectual questions and concerns raised.
2. Contextualization: Provide brief context for the scholarship put forward in the text.

3. Assessment: Provide an assessment of the text’s scholarly or academic potential. Reviews should discuss the work in its broader literary context, as well as consider which audience(s) would find the book useful.

Length

There are three possible lengths for reviews:

1. **Short Review** – This type of review should be between 750 and 1,000 words and should give a scholarly overview of the reviewed item. It should aim to briefly explain plot and characters and how they relate to science/speculative fiction concerns, and propose possible topics, themes, or other points of interest (see above questions).

2. **Review Essay** – This type of review should be between 1,500 and 2,000 words long and should give a more detailed and in-depth analysis of the reviewed item. Time should not be spent summarizing the plot or describing the characters in minute detail, except when it is in service of the analysis being conducted. This format favors joint reviews (between two reviewers) and comparative/contrastive reviews (between two or more items) and should aim to open discussion on a more specific topic than merely offer a cursory overview.

3. **Other** – Longer reviews, round table discussions, and other alternative formats are welcome but should be discussed with the editor before submission.