

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for providing your feedback to and evaluation of the attached submission to *On\_Culture*.

In the following pages you will find review criteria. Most important for us are the originality and quality of research and the question of how successfully the paper engages with the theme of the current issue. We send each article submission to two reviewers. The identity of the author is concealed, but if you feel that you recognize the individual's work and cannot proceed in an unbiased fashion, please do let us know.

This evaluation form consists of two parts:

- **1\_Criteria and space for providing feedback that will be given directly to the author.**  
We ask you to provide constructive criticism in this portion of the evaluation – if you feel the submission is lacking in quality please do communicate this but we would like to ask you to give the author something positive to work with. If you would like to directly comment on specific portions of the article using the comments and/or track changes functions, feel free to do so and submit the article with your changes and remarks included.
- **2\_A survey pertaining to submission criteria to be viewed by the Editorial Team only.**  
A checklist of criteria allows you to evaluate the article's success on a sliding scale.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Editorial Team member with whom you have been in contact should you have any questions pertaining to the process. We very much appreciate you taking the time to provide us with an expert opinion on this submission.

Sincerely,

The *On\_Culture* Editorial Team

## 1\_ Comments for the author

### **General points for preparing your report:**

When it comes to broad issues of structure and argument, the general rule is to give advice for improvement rather than attempting to make those improvements yourself – which also saves you time. To be as comprehensive and offer the author as much guidance as possible, be sure to support comments with specific examples from the text.

### **Criteria to keep in mind related to:**

- **CONTENT**

**Theme:** Does the article engage with the theme of the issue?

**Original research:** Is the article an original piece of research rather than a literature review or summary? Does it provide a significant/persuasive/interesting argument?

**Methodology:** Is the methodological approach appropriate for the subject matter? Are theories, terms and methods consistently used and clearly explained? Are the sources scientifically reliable?

**Primary sources:** Are quotes used effectively to back up points raised?

**Secondary material:** Does the author show knowledge of up-to-date research in the field without relying too heavily on secondary material rather than original thought?

- **STYLE**

**Overall structure:** Does the paper do what it sets out to do? Does it answer raised questions? Does it have a solid and well-framed introduction and well-supported conclusion? Does the title fit to the paper?

**Coherence:** Do paragraphs/sentences follow each other in logical structure? Can you follow the argumentation easily?

**Comprehensibility:** Are sentences clear and precise (rather than vague and inaccessible)?

**Referencing:** Has every source mentioned in the article been cited in the endnotes?

**Readability/Standard of academic English/German:** Is it well-written? Is the style engaging? Is the register appropriate?

**Grammar/Spelling:** Are there major grammar, spelling and/or punctuation problems? (isolated mistakes can be corrected by the reviewer with track changes or comments directly in the article, consistent problems in grammar/spelling should be indicated in the report.)

*Comments for the author:*

Article title: \_\_\_\_\_



Evaluation Form for Peer Reviewers

## *2\_Evaluation for On\_Culture Editorial Team*

Name reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

### Article

title: \_\_\_\_\_

Having written your report, please communicate your judgment to us by selecting and placing one of the following numbers (**1 – fails to meet, 2 – meets, 3 – exceeds**) to the points 1-10. Afterwards please give an overall recommendation.

### Reference to the research field and current issue

1\_Contribution to current research in its field\_\_\_\_\_

2\_Engagement with the theme of the current issue\_\_\_\_\_

### Content

3\_Consistent use of appropriate theoretical framework, analysis and methodology\_\_\_\_\_

4\_Handling of primary/source material\_\_\_\_\_

5\_Handling of secondary material\_\_\_\_\_

### Style

6\_Overall structure of argument\_\_\_\_\_

7\_Clarity and coherence of argument\_\_\_\_\_

8\_Standard of academic English/German; Style\_\_\_\_\_

9\_Referencing\_\_\_\_\_

10\_Spelling and punctuation\_\_\_\_\_

### Overall recommendation

**A** Accept for publication without revision

**AM** Accept subject to minor revision

**AS** Accept subject to substantial revision

**R** Rejection recommended

Your overall recommendation\_\_\_\_\_

If you have additional comments for the Editorial Team in general or pertaining to any of the ten points above, please include them on the following page.



Evaluation Form for Peer Reviewers

**Comments for the Editorial Team:**