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Tutorial Reviews are concise, authoritative overviews of important contemporary topics in the chemical sciences. They should appeal to advanced undergraduates, the general research chemist who is new to the field, as well as the expert. They provide a solid introduction to the development of a subject, the latest breakthrough results and their implications for the wider scientific community.

Tutorial Reviews must be:

* **Accessible**: Appeal to advanced undergraduate students and beyond. Tutorial reviews are often used in advanced undergraduate and Master’s studies.
* **Authoritative**: Provide an essential introduction to the field which will lay the foundation of knowledge in the area, followed by the most important recent advances. Authors should include throughout the article their own insights into the development of the field and its future potential.
* **Exciting**: In particular highlight areas where there has been a significant recent advance.
* **Concise**: There is no strict reference limit; however please include only the most important historical and recent research, referencing the major contributions. Tutorial Reviews are typically up to 15 journal pages in length.
* **Jargon free**: Specialist terms and symbols should be defined and fundamental ideas simply explained.

Tutorial reviews should include a 'key learning points' box, containing up to five key learning points that a reader should expect to gain from reading the review. These should be provided on submission, either at the beginning of the review or as a separate document.

All articles should focus on key developments in a field, with the author providing their own analysis and insight throughout on developments, trends, future directions and significance for the wider scientific community. **Articles which simply summarise research in the topic with minimal or no analysis or insight from the author are not suitable for publication in *Chem Soc Rev*.** To achieve this goal we ask authors to use new graphics where possible (e.g. by redrawing schemes), and to aim for no more than 20% of graphics in their article to be reused from previously published work. We understand that in some cases it is necessary to include more previously published graphics (for example, where graphs or microscope images are shown), and in these cases we ask authors to provide a very brief justification at full manuscript submission.
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Please complete all sections, ensuring your answers are succinct and within the word limit.

**1) Please comment on why the proposed topic is currently important**

Max. 100 words

**2) What are the implications for the wider scientific community?**

Max. 100 words

**3) To which communities will your article appeal?**

Max. 60 words

**4) Please comment on any other reviews published on a similar topic, justifying why there is room for another review. Why would a Tutorial-style article be the best format?**

**5) Tutorial reviews are expected to teach the reader about a topic which is not familiar to them. Please list up to five key points that a reader will learn from your review**

1.
2.
3.
4.

**6) Please provide section headings along with a brief discussion of each section and associated key references. This should:**

* **Clearly outline the intended content of the review**
* **Include at least 10 of the core references used to support your review**
* **Ensure that the title, authors, journal name, year, page numbers and DOI of each reference is included**

**7) Please comment on the collaboration between the authors listed on this synopsis:**

**- please give details on how all of the authors are connected, and**

**- please explain the expertise each author will bring to the review and their contributions.**
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Please provide a brief CV (maximum 3 A4 pages) or a link to your research webpage for the leading author(s) who should be authoritative in the proposed topic of the review.

Please provide a list of research articles in the suggested topic area and any reviews published bythe leading author in the last three years. Please ensure that the **title and DOI of each article** is included.

Please note that pre-approval of a proposal does not guarantee final publication: the manuscript will be subject to full peer review in accordance with the journal’s high standards.