

Reviewer Guidelines

1. PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Upon receipt of a manuscript, the responsible editor at *Nordisk Østforum* will first evaluate whether the manuscript fits within the journal's publishing profile and meets basic standards of quality. If the manuscript passes this preliminary editorial review, the next step is a double-blind peer review by two independent peers who hold a relevant doctoral degree or equivalent and are familiar with the actual topic(s). After the review process is completed, the responsible editor will make the final decision regarding acceptance/rejection of the manuscript. (NB: Peers do not receive payment for their reviews.)

2. PROCEDURES FOR PEER REVIEW

In carrying out a peer review for the journal, we ask you to provide an in-depth evaluation of the manuscript. *Nordisk Østforum* maintains high scientific standards of publication, and we therefore request a thorough evaluation of the scholarly merit of the manuscript and, in particular, comments on the following points:

- The originality of the manuscript (is it an original manuscript?).
- The logical coherence, structure, legibility and length of the manuscript.
- The current interest, value and relevance, in general and in relation to the journal's focus, e.g. does the manuscript advance new knowledge?
- Whether the issues addressed are discussed and analyzed in a proper way, and whether the conclusions are supported by the sources and data presented in the manuscript.
- Whether the use of sources is conscientious and methodologically acceptable.
- Whether the references are satisfactory and in accordance with the journal's author guidelines.
- Has the manuscript otherwise sufficient quality to be published as a peer-reviewed academic article?

Positive aspects of the manuscript should be emphasized. Any other remarks – in particular suggestions for improvement – should also be mentioned.

Your review may be written as a separate evaluation, following the points listed above, and/or as comments made directly in the manuscript file. Either way, your evaluation should clearly state whether you:

- Recommend publication as is (i.e., no need for any revision).
- Recommend publication after minor revisions (i.e., accept if the author makes the requested small changes).
- Revision and further review (i.e., comprehensive revisions are necessary, thereafter another round of peer review).
- Do not recommend publication.

The journal's peer review process is reciprocally anonymous. Therefore, please be sure that your identity cannot be inferred from your review file(s) before you send us your review. More information about ensuring a blind review and instructions for anonymizing files can be found here: [Support Microsoft Office](#).

We ask that peers complete their reviews within four weeks.