

GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Suitable submissions to RIPU Journal undergo a double-blind peer-review process: The author's identity is not revealed to the reviewers, and vice versa. The editor's team determines two reviewers. If their conclusions are not unanimous, a third reviewer may be consulted. If an article is published, the names of the approving reviewers are published as well in the list of reviewers, but without references to a specific paper. Reviews should provide the editors with information and arguments upon which they can base their decisions. The editors of RIPU Journal take seriously the reviewers' criticisms. However, final decisions about whether or in what form a manuscript is published are left to the discretion of the editors. Reviews should offer substantial reasons for accepting or not accepting a given article for publication, specific observations or suggestions for improvements and revisions.

Reviewers are kindly asked to specify in which way and to what extent the article satisfies, or fails to satisfy, the following criteria:

- Is the theme of the article of relevance and interest to the field of art history?
- Is the theme consistent with the general editorial guidelines?
- Is the title of the article in keeping with its subject?
- Does the article offer new research material?
- Does it offer new perspectives on established issues?
- Are the arguments consistent?
- Is the article written in a clear and readable style?
- Are all relevant findings by earlier scholars taken into account?

Reviewers are kindly asked to include one of the following statements to conclude their overall evaluation:

- I recommend it for publication (as is).
- I recommend it for publication with minor changes (to be specified in overall evaluation).
- Invitation to rework the article and resubmit it to peer reviewer"
- I do not recommend it for publication.

Reviewers are kindly asked to classify the article according to following suggestions:

- **Research paper** (presents the results of original research that were not previously published in either full or preliminary form).
- **Preliminary communication** (contains at least one new scientific fact or result that should be published)
- **Review paper** (contains an overall review of recent and current research in a specific area. Papers in this category are surveys in nature that should contain critical references and evaluations; the references must be complete enough to permit a good insight into the subject matter).

- **Professional paper** (does not have to be based on original research, but it should contribute to the application of well-known research results and present theoretical conceptions).

Title of the article	
Name of the reviewer	
Academic degree	
Institution	
e-mail	

Overall evaluation of the article (obligatory, preferably not shorter than one page in length):