



MOOREPOSTS



PUBLISHING STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES



Version 1.1

Fall 2025

© 2025 Mooreposts LLC.
mooreposts.com
info.mooreposts@gmail.com





Publisher

Mooreposts LLC.
Mooreposts.com
info.mooreposts@gmail.com

Editor-in-Chief

Connor JL Moore
connorjlmoore@gmail.com

Editor-at-Large

Braxton Fuller
fullerbraxton@gmail.com

Managing Editor

Noelle Calhoun
noellecalhoun3@gmail.com

Media Director

Lindsey Ferrini
lindsey.ferrini@du.edu

Editors

Cierra Walker
Liam Conroy
Mia Navarro
Conor Farrell
Alex Rudnik
Niko Pravikoff
Caden Scates
Jonathan Rockford
Emily Shafer
Kira Hensley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

01	ABOUT	
	WHO WE ARE	01
	WHY PUBLISH WITH MOOREPOSTS?	01
02	CREDIBILITY, STANDARDS, & ETHICS	
	HOW WE UPHOLD CREDIBILITY	02
03	GUIDELINES	
	TOPICAL SCOPE	03
	FORMATS	03
	STYLE GUIDE	04
	CITATIONS	05
04	SUBMISSIONS & PUBLICATION PROCESS	
	SUBMISSION INQUIRY	05
	PRELIMINARY EDIT	06
	SECONDARY EDITS	07
	PUBLICATION & POST-PUBLICATION	08
05	GUIDE & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDITORS	
	INTRODUCTION	10
	PRINCIPLES OF THE BLIND REVIEW	10
	REQUIRED TASKS	11
	EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK	13
	CONCLUSION	13

CONTRIBUTORS PRE-PUBLICATION CHECKLIST

POST-BLIND EDIT 1	14
COMPLETION OF EDITORIAL PROCESS	15



MOOREPOSTS ABOUT, CREDIBILITY, PUBLICATION GUIDELINES & PROCESS

WHO WE ARE

In a world of increasing misinformation and confusion, *Mooreposts is dedicated to providing the general public with accessible, credible, and high-quality scholarly insights.* Our digital and physical publications encompass a diverse range of topics and media, featuring contributions from emerging academics, established professionals, and curious minds. Mooreposts is not only rooted in creating accessible knowledge but also in connecting readers with nonprofits to drive meaningful impact and translate our contributors' passions into tangible results.

WHY PUBLISH WITH MOOREPOSTS?

Publishing with Mooreposts offers more than solely providing public scholarship. Contributors join a growing network of scholars, professionals, and advocates who are all committed to making a meaningful impact. Those who pass our rigorous submission and publication process will have their work professionally shared with an expanding audience across multiple platforms. Beyond providing ways to build credibility and experience in a peer-review process, Mooreposts makes it a primary goal to provide contributors with exposure. This includes a bio page detailing the contributor's background, any media or content they would like shared, nonprofits they support, and ways to connect with them.

Anyone passionate about a relevant topic who can provide credible and well-informed work is welcome to submit to Mooreposts. Our team primarily looks for work related to politics, policy, history, and international affairs, but occasionally we consider proposals that may fall outside this scope. Additionally, we offer authors greater flexibility in publication formats—from a variety of written styles/formats to visual and auditory mediums—to accommodate unique styles. For further information on specific ethical standards, credibility, style guide, and submission process, please refer to the relevant sections below in this document. Please note—beyond this document—Mooreposts is actively seeking and pursuing third-party and accredited organizations for future independent accreditation certifications.

WANT TO JOIN THE TEAM?

Contact info.mooreposts@gmail.com & noellecalhoun3@gmail.com

CREDIBILITY, STANDARDS, & ETHICS

Mooreposts is dedicated to maintaining the highest standards of intellectual credibility, diversity & inclusion, integrity, and public responsibility. We require all publications to reflect original thought, provide advanced written, visual, and/or auditory communication, quality sourcing, and ethical consideration. Any plagiarism, manipulated data, misrepresented arguments, etc., are prohibited. Mooreposts reserves the right to reject any submission or remove previously published works that do not align with or violate our mission, values, standards, and/or general requirements.

To uphold these standards, Mooreposts utilizes software tools and an extensive peer-review and publication process to detect any academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and/or misuse of artificial intelligence. If a team member suspects or identifies any misconduct, it will be flagged and undergo a three-person integrity review. Two additional team members will independently and blindly assess the work. If two of three reviewers affirm the presence of misconduct, the work will be rejected or removed. In the event of serious violations, the contributor will be permanently banned from submitting and publishing to Mooreposts in the future.

Mooreposts recognizes that artificial intelligence is increasingly being used as a tool, but we require complete transparency regarding its utilization. Any use of generative artificial intelligence is required to be disclosed during the submission process. The use of any of these artificial intelligence platforms should be viewed as a tool—under no circumstances should it be used to provide writing/manuscripts, sources, data, or other content intended to be original.

Contributors are required to complete a legally binding contract that affirms their work is original, accurately presented, and sourced, free of artificial intelligence abuse/misuse, and accompanied by full disclosure of relevant funding, affiliations, and/or conflicts of interest. Mooreposts also necessitate contributors to provide respectful and inclusive content that fosters engagement and dialogue. We do not tolerate hate speech, content that endangers others, discriminatory rhetoric, or the promotion of misinformation.

When publishing with Mooreposts, contributors not only contribute to spreading public knowledge but also help build a credible and trusted space for critical inquiry and respectful debate. All contributors are expected to approach their craft and production of content with integrity, thoughtfulness, and a commitment to truth. Publications/content from our contributors do not reflect the official positions or beliefs of Mooreposts—any argument, stated beliefs/opinions, etc., only reflect those of the contributor(s).

GUIDELINES

Mooreposts is currently focused on publishing works that cover domestic politics, law, theory, and international affairs, spanning a wide range of subtopics in these fields. We strongly encourage anyone to submit proposals who has insightful, well-researched content and/or experience within their respective fields/subject matter.

Desired Topical Scope

- Domestic Politics & Governance (e.g., campaigns, institutions, policy-making & analysis, political ideologies/parties, constitutions, media, etc.).
- International Relations, Studies, & Global Affairs (e.g., foreign policy by country or region, security, strategy, war/conflict, peacebuilding, diplomacy/negotiation, great power politics, global governance, doctrine, cyber threats/information warfare, strategic intelligence/espionage/covert action, global/transnational issues, economics/trade, environment, development, human rights, international law, etc.).
- Comparative Politics & Regional Studies (e.g., regime types and change, ethnic politics and conflicts, electoral systems, institutions, regional case studies, etc.).
- Political & Legal Theory, Philosophy, & Culture (e.g., classical and contemporary political/legal thought, ideologies, critical theory, etc.).
- Historiography & Historical Inquiry (e.g., key debates over a topic/subject in the discipline of history, historical studies, historical analysis of contemporary matters, etc.).
- Technology & Business (e.g., AI governance, misinformation, regulation, surveillance, analysis of corporations and impacts, developments, etc.).
- Research Methods & Debates (e.g., reviews/analysis of qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods approaches, interpersonal scholarly debates, critical reflections, etc.).

General Formats

- Opinion Editorials: Provide informed, cited, and clear arguments/perspectives on contemporary topics and issues. Avoid jargon and technical vocabulary; focus on perspectives if applicable, and use real-world analogies or hooks.
[Word Count: ~800 – 1,000 words]
- Explainer Pieces: Provide clarification on complex issues, topics, processes, events, or concepts for the general public in an informative, neutral, and structured style. Utilize a question-and-answer/listed format. Include digestible sections, focus on clarity, avoid jargon (explain if necessary), and include reliable citations for claims.
[Word Count: ~500 – 1,000 words]
- Research-Informed Commentary: Provide a readable translation of established academic research that focuses on explanation and clarity. Identify central arguments, findings, relevance, context, limitations, and policy/societal implications.
[Word Count: ~800 – 1,000 words]
- Book Reviews & Review Essays: Provide a critical, fair, and non-promotional evaluation of a recent or classical publication or content that is relevant to the topical scope. Place the work within its relevant conversation or debate and provide a succinct summary of the key claims, analyzing the work's strengths, weaknesses, and implications.
[Word Count: ~500 – 1,500 words]
- Academic Essays: Provide a thorough, research-based argument on the general topical scope that is suitable for readers seeking scholarly rigor and depth. Present a clear thesis, evidence, and analysis, while utilizing academic citation styles (include bibliography).
[Word Count: ~2,000 – 5,000 words]
- Reflection & First-Person Essays: Provide thoughtful and insightful personal perspectives on experiences related to the general topical scope. Take a narrative, storytelling,

introspective, and/or grounded tone, connecting personal insights within a broader context—no self-promotion or unsupported assertions.

[Word Count: ~800 – 1,000 words]

- Policy Briefs, Threat Assessments, and Strategic Memos: Provide timely, analysis-centered takes and prescriptive guidance focused on educating the public and decision-makers. These styles distill complex issues into understandable and actionable guidance/framing. The tone should be clear, direct, concise, objective, and informative. Works can include an executive summary or bottom line (e.g., what is the issue, context, its importance, what should be done).

[Word Count: ~500 – 1,000 words]

- Interviews & Scholarly Dialogues/Debates: Provide in-depth conversations with experts or leaders on relevant contemporary issues within the general topical scope. Include structured, clear, and digestible point-counterpoint exchanges between scholars/experts/leaders within debated topics and/or fields. Formats can include Q&A interviews, written exchanges, or roundtable conversations.

[Word Count: ~800 – 2,000 words]

- Video & Social Media Styled Content: For further details and requirements, contact info.mooreposts@gmail.com, lindsey.ferrini@du.edu, and noellecalhoun3@gmail.com.

Helpful General Guides: [Harvard's How To Write An Op-Ed Or Column](#), [The New York Times' Why We Write Explainers: An explainer](#), [Stanford's Tips for Writing Policy Papers](#), [Harvard's The Structure of an Academic Paper](#), [Threat Assessment Example – Office of the Director of National Intelligence Annual Threat Assessment](#), [USC's Writing Academic Book Reviews](#).

General Style Guide

- Tone: Use explicit, clear, and concise declarative sentences—avoid passive voice.
- General Structure
 - 1) **Introduction** – hook line, purpose, research question(s), works organization, argument [if applicable].
 - 2) **Body** – evidence, counterpoints, dialogues, etc.
 - 3) **Analysis** [if applicable] – explanation of above, flaws/contradictions, counterarguments, etc.
 - 4) **Conclusion** – restate purpose, research question(s), argument, brief evidence/wrap-up, implications [if applicable], and hook ending.
 - 5) **Author/Contributors information**
- Style Conventions
 - Use “percent,” not “%”.
 - References: use “US” and/or “U.S.” and “Political Party” for the entity's full name.
 - Avoid paywalled sources if possible.
 - Avoid academic jargon; if necessary, explain it in layman's terms.
 - Do not assume the audience's prior knowledge.
 - Do not rely on rhetorical questions; if used, answer quickly.
 - Use *italics*, underline, and **bold** sparingly for emphasis.

- Utilize [Oxford commas](#).
- Spell out numbers [if appropriate]; unless beginning with a sentence, use numerals for ten [10] and above.
- Spell out the appropriate, full names of authors/leaders/parties/people included.
- Fully spell out dates (i.e., July 4, 2025) [if appropriate].
- Utilize American spelling formats (i.e., ‘organization’ instead of ‘organisation’).
- Optional: visuals and supplementary materials (e.g., charts, timelines, maps, tables, etc.) that include title, labels, legend, [if applicable], and source.

Recommended Citation Styles & Resources

[Turabian Manual \(9th ed.\)](#)

[Chicago Manual of Style \(17th ed.\)](#)

[APA Publication Manual \(7th ed.\)](#)

[Hyperlinks](#) (Appropriate only for op-eds, explainer pieces, research-informed commentary, reflection & first-person essays, or previously approved by the Managing Editor).

*Please reach out to info.mooreposts@gmail.com and noellecalhoun3@gmail.com if any questions arise about possible topics, appropriate styles/formats, and/or citations.

SUBMISSIONS & PUBLICATION PROCESS

Mooreposts maintains a structured, ethical, and thoughtful editorial process to ensure our readers can trust and inquire about the content of works published on the site and its additional media platforms. This includes an extensive review of academic integrity, peer-reviewed, and a blind editing process, followed by post-publication requirements.

Submission Inquiry

Prospective contributors *MUST* submit an initial proposal in .docx or .pdf format to the Managing Editor, Noelle Calhoun (noellecalhoun3@gmail.com), that includes the following elements/steps:

- 1) **Overview** [one **bolded** sentence at the top of the page]
Format: **[Writer's full name]: [Topic/Preliminary Title], [Category], [Optional – Urgency of the Content]**
- 2) **Proposal** [1-2 paragraphs, 200 – 300 words]
An explanation/background of the topic, its relevance/author's purpose, and the preliminary argument(s) and/or findings.
*Prospective authors/contributors [separate from word count] must also disclose any relevant funding or conflicts of interest at the end of the proposal.
- 3) **Response**: We aim to review and respond to all proposals within 3-5 business days. For time-sensitive or rapidly developing topics, submitters are encouraged to indicate urgency

by including “*Timely/Urgent*” in the email subject line and marking the *email as high priority*.

- I. The Managing Editor initially assesses all proposals to verify that the submission aligns with our standards, mission, and requirements. Prior to sending a decision, the Editor-in-Chief and Editor-at-Large will independently affirm or provide concerns regarding the Managing Editor’s preliminary recommendation.
- II. Only upon dual editorial approval will the submission proceed to the preliminary editing process. If the proposal is denied, the submitter will receive a formal email detailing the reason(s) for the decision, including feedback focused on encouraging future submissions if appropriate.

Preliminary Manuscript Review & Feedback

Upon preliminary approval, the submitter will be asked to provide a first draft/manuscript [.docx or .pdf format] that meets the requirements below. The first draft will then be sent to a Mooreposts editor, who will conduct a blind review and provide preliminary feedback and copy-edits, which the Managing Editor will then return to the submitter.

1) Introduction

- a) Overall claim/argument/purpose (refer to style guide if in doubt).
- b) Why the proposal is important, relevant, and/or educational.

2) General Evidence

- a) Reference preliminary evidence [references, sources, data, etc.] which may support the argument, findings, and/or implications of the work.
 - i) Format: hyperlinks/appropriate in-text citations and/or preliminary bibliography [excluded from word count].
 - (1) For works using *quantitative methods*, the proposal must also be accompanied by the databases/sources, statistical descriptives, an explanation of methods used, etc.
 - (2) If the submitter already has a completed draft, please indicate whether (i) an institutional writing center has revised it, (ii) an instructor or PhD candidate has graded it in an academic course, and/or (iii) it has been professionally peer-reviewed. Please attach proof/documentation of such processes [edited drafts, instructor comments/affirmation, etc.].
 - (a) If a proposal is accompanied by verifiable, expert-level, peer-reviewed documentation, the work may be expedited to final review, legal agreements, and publication.

3) Submitter Response

- a) If applicable, following a Mooreposts response, the submitter must either satisfy the initial edit or provide comments/appeals for further consideration.
 - i) This process may take multiple attempts to complete and is at the discretion of the assigned editor and Managing Editor.

Secondary Edits

Once preliminary edits have been completed, further secondary edits may be necessary, and if so, they must be satisfied by the submitter.

1) Secondary Edits

- a) Copy-edits and feedback will continue to be blindly transmitted from the submitter to the editor through the managing editor.
- b) The secondary draft process may require multiple attempts until the revisions are satisfactory to both the assigned editor and the Managing Editor based on Mooreposts' styles/formats, ethics, requirements, and standards.

Final Review/Approval, Submitter Information, & Legal Agreements

Upon the completion of satisfactory secondary edits, the Editor-in-Chief and Editor-at-large will conduct a final review, double-checking for any missed errors or issues. Upon satisfactory results, the submitter will be sent an official approval message, a request for their biographical information, and a legal contractual agreement that covers an affidavit of compliance with Mooreposts' ethical standards, agreements over the ownership and use of the author's/contributor's work(s), and post-publication expectations.

1) Final Review & Approval

- a) Following satisfaction of secondary edits via the assigned editor and Managing Editor, the work will be sent to the Editor-in-Chief and Editor-at-Large for final review.
 - i) If an issue arises, the work will be sent back to the Managing Editor and Submitter for further consideration.
- b) Upon approval, the submitter will be sent an approval message, a request for biographical information [included in their profile page on Mooreposts], and a contractual, legally binding contract.

2) Submitter Information

- a) Portrait Photo
 - i) [Required] – Portrait photo [preferably professional] for Mooreposts profile page, submit in a JPEG or PNG format.
- b) Personal Bio [4-6 concise sentences – written in the third-person, not included in word count]
 - i) [Required] – Detail academic background and/or professional experience
 - ii) [Required] – Preferred email address to be displayed
 - iii) [Optional] – Any information about you (e.g., interests, hobbies/passions, etc.)
 - iv) [Optional] – Why did you decide to submit/publish to Mooreposts?
 - v) [Optional] – Links to personal media/promotional content and/or promoted nonprofits

3) Legal Agreements

- a) For publication to occur, all submitters/contributors must sign or re-sign the legal agreement. Failure to do so will result in either stalling the publication or its termination from further consideration by Mooreposts.

Publication & Post-Publication

The submitter and future author/contributor will be kept apprised of the timeline and preference(s) for publication. All publication dates and related promotional materials for any publication are set at the discretion of the Founder, Connor JL Moore, and Partner, Braxton Fuller. Upon official publication, all contributors will be held to the following post-publication standards:

1) Continued Commitment to Accuracy & Integrity

- a) Contributors remain responsible for the accuracy and integrity of their work post-publication. Should any issues with the evidence or factual clarifications arise, contributors are expected to notify the Managing Editor in a timely manner. Mooreposts reserves the right to issue corrections or editorial notes when appropriate or necessary.

2) Copyright & Republication

- a) Contributors are subject to Mooreposts' Contributor Agreement. All accepted and published works become the exclusive intellectual property of Mooreposts. Contributors assign full publication rights to Mooreposts, which retains the authority to archive, promote, distribute, and reformat the material across platforms and affiliated channels.
- b) Contributors may reference or summarize their Mooreposts publications elsewhere for educational, personal, or professional purposes, provided that Mooreposts receives full attribution.

3) Disputes, Corrections, & Clarifications

- a) In the event a reader, team member, or other individual perceives an editorial concern, Mooreposts will investigate the error/concern in a timely and impartial manner. If the concern is confirmed, a correction notice, clarification, and/or an editor's note may be issued and appended to the publication.
- b) The contributor may also be notified if their publication receives formal rebuttals, scholarly inquiry, and/or significant public criticism that is submitted to Mooreposts for review. If appropriate, contributors will be encouraged to provide a thoughtful, professional response for publication or internal record. Mooreposts retains the discretion regarding whether such responses/inquiries are published or not.

- c) Contributors will be apprised of any concerns/inquiries and plans to publish any correction, clarification, appended editorial note, and/or critical response.
- 4) Retractions
- a) Cases regarding retractions include:
 - i) Proven plagiarism, misrepresentation, or any academic dishonesty
 - ii) Fabricated or falsified data
 - iii) Violations of Mooreposts' ethics/standards
 - iv) Legal risks (i.e., copyright infringement, defamation, etc.)
 - b) If a retraction is warranted, the publication will be removed and replaced with a retraction notice, which details the reason for such action.

Please contact info.mooreposts@gmail.com and noellecalhoun3@gmail.com if you have any questions, comments, concerns, or inquiries.



MOOREPOSTS OFFICIAL GUIDE & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDITORS

INTRODUCTION

Welcome, and thank you for contributing to Mooreposts as a valuable member of our editorial team. Our editors play a crucial role in our mission to provide the general public with accessible, credible, and high-quality scholarly insights. The blind review process is vital to advancing our mission and upholding our standards of credibility, critical inquiry, objectivity, accountability, and academic integrity. By ensuring submissions to Mooreposts are judged solely on their merit, you help us maintain the high standards we hold our company to and build trust for our audience.

This guide outlines your responsibilities, general standards you are expected to uphold, and the procedures/recommendations for providing effective constructive feedback. Your diligence and thoughtful critique are invaluable to our contributors and essential to the reputation of Mooreposts.

PRINCIPLES OF THE BLIND REVIEW

The purpose of our blind review process is to eliminate bias. You won't know the identity of the contributor, and they won't know yours. To maintain anonymity, all communication and draft transfers will be facilitated by the Managing Editor or, if needed, other Mooreposts leadership members. This process ensures that each manuscript is evaluated based on its content, logic/argumentation, and quality, rather than any characteristics of the author or contributor.

As a Mooreposts editor, you are the foundation upon which we act on our principles and standards. Therefore, the review you conduct must be done with the utmost professionalism and adherence to our ethics.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Throughout the entire consideration process, editorial drafts, and final approval phases, it is strictly prohibited to upload, copy, or paste any part (e.g., submission consideration, preliminary drafts, manuscripts, or supplementary materials) of the contributor's submission into any third-party generative artificial intelligence platforms (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, etc.). Editors can use certain functions on Grammarly that focus on grammar and punctuation, but its generative features are prohibited.

Failure to comply with this critical requirement poses risks of breaching confidentiality, which may include violating intellectual property laws and rights/regulations. Also, it strips the contributor of control over their original work and potential private data.

REQUIRED TASKS TO COMPLETE

Review for Potential Abuse of Standards and Academic Misconduct

Plagiarism – unattributed text, data, or ideas.

AI Abuse – content that appears to have been generated by AI (i.e., plain/generic phrasing, lacking a clear tone/voice, odd structuring, and/or incorrect claims/facts).

Fabrication or Falsification of Data – invented and/or manipulated data, sources, or visuals.

Misrepresentation – gross misrepresentation of other scholars' or writers' arguments or findings.

Violations of Mooreposts' Ethics – content including hate speech, discriminatory or endangering rhetoric, and/or promotion of misinformation.

Suspected Violations Procedure – If you suspect any form of misconduct/abuse, do not make any accusatory comments in the initial submission or drafts. Instead, end your review and contact the Managing Editor, Noelle Calhoun, via a private email. In your confidential communication, please provide a summary of your concerns or suspicions, followed by details (e.g., citing specific examples, passages, or sources you are aware of that are contradictory or plagiarized). The Managing Editor will then initiate a formal three-person integrity review process.

Argument & Logic

Consider the author's central thesis or purpose:

- Is it clear, compelling, and stated early?
- Is the argument logical, well-supported, and coherent?
- Are counterarguments considered and addressed where appropriate?
- Does the conclusion effectively summarize the work and reiterate its significance?

Structure & Flow

Review the author's overall structure and flow:

- Is it well-organized and easy to follow?
- Do paragraphs and sections transition smoothly?
- Does the structure align with the format guidelines for the submission type (e.g., Op-Ed, Academic Essay, Explainer)?

Clarity, Tone, & Readability

Edit for syntax, accessibility for the general public, and the author's tone:

- Is the language clear, concise, and understandable/accessible to general readers?
- Is the tone appropriate for the Mooreposts format?

Evidence & Sourcing

Check for and verify citations:

- Is the evidence provided relevant and sufficient to support the claims?
- Are sources credible and correctly cited according to our recommended styles (Turabian, Chicago, APA)?
- For op-eds and similar formats, are hyperlinks used effectively, and do they lead to non-paywalled (preferred, but not required), reliable sources where possible?

Citation Resources:

[Turabian Manual \(9th ed.\)](#)

[Chicago Manual of Style \(17th ed.\)](#)

[APA Publication Manual \(7th ed.\)](#)

[Hyperlinks](#)

*Grammar, Style, & Formatting**

Check for:

- Grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.
- Ensure adherence to the Mooreposts General Style Guide.
- Correct any formatting inconsistencies.

General Style Guide

Use explicit and declarative sentences—avoid passive voice

General Structure

- Introduction – (e.g., hook line, purpose, research question(s) [if applicable], works organization [if applicable], hypothesis/argument, implications [if applicable]).
- Body – evidence, counterpoints, dialogues, etc.
- Analysis [optional & if applicable] – explanation of above, flaws/contradictions, counterarguments, etc.
- Conclusion – restate purpose, research question(s), argument, brief evidence/wrap-up, implications [if applicable], and hook ending.
- Author/Contributors information – (e.g., so-and-so is a current MA candidate for Human Rights at the University of Colorado).

Style Conventions

- Use “percent,” not “%”.
- References: use “US” and/or “U.S.” and “Political Party” for the entity's full name.
- Avoid paywalled sources if possible.
- Avoid academic jargon; if necessary, explain it in layman's terms.
- Do not assume the audience's prior knowledge.

- Do not rely on rhetorical questions; if used, answer quickly.
- Use *italics*, underline, and **bold** sparingly for emphasis.
- Utilize [Oxford Commas](#).
- Spell out numbers [if appropriate]; unless beginning with a sentence, use numerals for ten [10] and above.
- Spell out the appropriate, full names of authors/leaders/parties/people included.
- Fully spell out dates (i.e., July 4, 2025) [if appropriate].
- Utilize American spelling formats (i.e., ‘organization’ instead of ‘organisation’).
- Optional: visuals and supplementary materials (e.g., charts, timelines, maps, tables, etc.) that include title, labels, legend, [if applicable], and source.

***IMPORTANT NOTE FOR ISSUING EDITS:** For organization and comprehension in our process, please attempt to distinguish between major and minor issues. Here, it is recommended to use comments for substantive feedback on logic, clarity, and structure. For issues like typos, style guide, or grammar, use the suggestion features on the utilized platform that allow the contributor to view the recommended changes.

HOW TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK

While higher academia is notorious for its ruthlessness and competitiveness in scholarship, debates, and critiques—to those who have been exposed—we do not want this to be part of our editorial process. Instead, here are some helpful tips for providing constructive, respectful feedback that **encourages** our contributors to continue with the editorial and potential publication process.

Be Clear, Specific, and Objective – instead of ‘This paragraph is confusing,’ try ‘This paragraph could be clarified,’ ‘As a reader, I was unsure how the point about X connects to the overall argument about Y,’ ‘Consider adding a transitional sentence.’ ‘Just a thought, but here’s how I might word it/this: ...’.

Balance Critique with Praise – try beginning your overall feedback with a positive comment on the manuscript's strengths. Acknowledge what the author does well before diving into areas for improvement.

Use Suggestive Language – attempt to frame feedback through suggestions or questions. For instance, write: ‘Have you considered...?’, ‘This might be stronger if...’, ‘Just a thought, but here’s how I might word it/this: ...’, ‘I wonder if this point/section might be more impactful if...’.

CONCLUSION

Once again, we thank you for all your efforts and diligence in this process. Your contribution as a Mooreposts editor and execution of our blind review process are integral components of our team, community, and overall respectability. Should you have any questions or require

clarification/assistance over any points in this guide or process, please do not hesitate to contact the Managing Editor or other members of the Mooreposts leadership.



*Mooreposts Contributors
Pre-Publication Checklist*

WHAT MOOREPOSTS NEEDS BEFORE FINAL APPROVAL AND PUBLICATION

*Steps Following — “**Blind Edit One** (AUTHOR REVIEW)”*

Illustration for Publication

- ☐ The contributor will be put in contact with an illustrator for their piece. We ask that the contributor stay in constant contact with the illustrator and provide any ideas [i.e., depictions, images, design features, styles, etc.] that the contributor would like included.

Contributor Profile

- ☐ If the contributor does not already have a profile on Mooreposts, please [write a 5-7 sentence bio](#) detailing your educational background [i.e., degree(s) from higher institutions of learning] and/or professional experience [and affiliated companies/organizations]. Optional, but appreciated information can also include: why you are contributing or are a part of the Mooreposts team, professional goals/ambitions, passions within or outside of your professional life, and/or academic interests/specializations, etc.
 - ☐ Attach a [portrait photo of yourself](#) (preferably business professional) via JPEG, PNG, etc.
- ☐ Optional: any general and/or nonprofit(s) related to the article and/or promoted by the author/contributor
 - ☐ Include a link to the organization(s) about information and donation page.
 - ☐ Brownie points if the contributor provides us with free domain photos of the nonprofits for advertising within the publication and a brief summary of the organization(s) work [examples below].

In 1971, after a coup d'état, the Alawite minority Hafez al-Assad established a totalitarian monarchy through the Ba'ath Party. The party gained control of trade unions, civil society, and state institutions, supported internationally and regionally by presenting itself as an anti-imperialist and anti-Israeli regime. Iran and Russia provided financial and military support in exchange for proxy influence in the Middle East, particularly the Levant. The Assad family's rule was often denoted by exploiting societal divisions, suppressing dissent and free speech, restricting Sunni government participation and political reach, and utilizing violence as an enforcement mechanism. In 2000, after Hafez al-Assad's death, his son, Bashar al-Assad, assumed power. Initially, Syrians were hopeful for liberalization and reform, yet quickly realized that there would be a continuation of authoritarian rule, one marked by corruption, violence, and brutality.



In 2011, with the sweeping Arab Spring uprisings, the duplicity and cruelty of the Assad regime were further revealed and spread through social media and civil unrest. To combat the protests, Bashar al-Assad engaged in violent crackdowns, such as chemical attacks and prolonged slow conflict, that displaced over 7 million Syrians. Although HTS' rebel-led offensive catalyzed the physical collapse of



Description of the Work

- ☐ Please provide a [concise description of the work](#) via email or within the next draft, which will be included on the homepage, publications page, and social media posts. Depending on the work category type found at the top of Mooreposts publications page [e.g., op-ed, explainer, article, etc.], this could include: a catchy intro sentence of the topic, the importance of the topic, and/or the contributor's argument, etc.
- ☐ Brownie points for contributor: please provide a bullet point list including: the catchy/importance of the topic, the argument, the evidence used, and any prescriptives. This will help us start transforming the publication into a new content medium, such as Instagram Reels!

Contributors Mooreposts Social Media Sharing Preferences

- ☐ Via email to Mooreposts editorial leadership team, please [indicate your preferences regarding how we share your personal/professional information](#). This includes:
 - ☐ Whether the contributor wants to be tagged and/or invited to collaborate on an Instagram post regarding their work [*accepting a collaboration invitation will also make the post visible on the contributor's Instagram profile*].
 - ☐ Whether the contributor wants to be mentioned via @[contributor's LinkedIn profile] on the work's official LinkedIn post.
 - While Mooreposts would appreciate and benefit from the exposure via tagging, collaborating, or mentioning the contributors' social media profiles in our posts, we respect and want the contributors to feel comfortable in protecting their social profile(s) privacy. **Please do not feel pressured to accept some or all of these sharing methods!**

Steps Following Completion of the Editorial Process

Final Approvals

- ☐ Upon completion of edits and the blind editors' approval, the contributor [must email the editorial leadership team, indicating their approval for publication](#).

Contributor Contractual Agreement

- ☐ Before publishing, the [contributor must review and sign](#) our ***Mooreposts Author and Contributor Responsibility and Intellectual Property Agreement***, which will be sent via DocuSign to the contributor.

Optional

- ☐ Mooreposts would greatly appreciate and benefit from the [contributor reposting, sharing, liking, etc., the official social media posts regarding their work and/or mooreposts.com!](#)