

JAR

Journal for Artistic Research - Peer Review Form

Dear reviewer,

Before you start working on the submission and your assessment, please take a look at the questions that we ask so as to be able to structure your review accordingly.

There are 9 sections:

1. Reviewer self-assessment
2. Assessment of artistic and intellectual interest
3. Assessment of whether the submission fulfils its potential
4. Assessment of whether the submission exposes artistic practice *as research*
5. Assessment of whether the exposition design and navigation support the (artistic) proposition
6. Any ethical or legal concerns
7. Your conclusions (including ways to improve the submission)
8. Your recommendations: whether the submission should be published or rejected
9. Your feedback

The questions that are asked in those sections should be considered as a guideline for your review. **Please feel free to deviate** from them should you think the submission or your review requires that.

The default practice of JAR's review process is anonymous peer review. However, if a submission is accepted, we kindly ask you to compile a final set of comments based on the re-worked submission. Your comments together with those of the other reviewers will be published attached to the submission as 'JAR Reviewer Comments' and linked to from the JAR table of contents. As a default, we will publish your comments together with your name unless otherwise instructed.

When you formulate your assessment please take into consideration that what you write may anonymously be sent as feedback to the artist(s)/author(s).

Submission details

Name artist(s)/author(s):	
Title of the submission:	
URL of the submission:	
Review requested on [date]:	

Reviewer details

Name:	
Affiliation/occupation:	
E-mail:	
Review returned on [date]:	

1. Reviewer Self-assessment

Knowledge of artist(s)/author(s) - possible conflict of interest: Please state any relationship you have with the artist(s)/author(s):

[50 words maximum]

Your area of expertise: Please indicate which area(s) of your expertise is/are relevant to this review:

[50 words maximum]

What level of expertise do you have in the subject area / discipline / practice exposed in this submission? [Please indicate with an X]

High level of expertise	Medium level of expertise	Low level of expertise
-------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

2. Artistic and intellectual interest

Is the exposition of artistic and/or intellectual interest?

Note: Although difficult to assess, expositions are sought that endeavour to address important artistic issues or intellectual problems in a particular artistic manner that engage others in the field. Please tell us whether or not the submission is interesting in its subject, methods or outcomes.

[500 words maximum]

Outstanding	Very good	Good	Adequate	Unsatisfactory		High	Medium	Low
----------------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------------	-------------------------	--	---------------	-----------------	--------------

Please indicate your prognosis of the reception of (up to five) possible fields, discourses, communities, or disciplines.

[50 words maximum]

Assessment of interest					My confidence level in assessing this is		
1 (poor)	2	3	4	5 (high)	High	Medium	Low

3. Does the exposition fulfil its potential?

Note: The Editorial Board of JAR deems it important that reviewers also judge the artistic or intellectual potential of a submission and whether its exposition lives up to it. If not, we ask you to suggest ways to improve the submissions so as to get the best out of it. Please focus specifically on these potentials (if there are any) when answering this question.

[200 words maximum]

Assessment					My confidence level in assessing this is		
Outstanding	Very good	Good	Adequate	Unsatisfactory	High	Medium	Low

4. Does the submission expose practice as research?

Note: In JAR, practice is exposed, translated, transformed, performed, curated etc. as research in an artistic way. The claim to be research implies a relationship in one way or another to academic and artistic criteria for the conduct of research. The submission need not comply with all (or even one) of the points listed here. But one might question whether it does, and if not, what the artistic, aesthetic or intellectual rationale is.

Please take into account:

- whether or not the submission contains a description or exposition of the question, issue or problem the research is exploring, and if not, if such an omission matters;
- whether or not the submission shows evidence of innovation in content, form or technique in relation to a genre of practice, and if not, if such an omission matters;

- whether or not the research issue is contextualized, which may include social, artistic and/or theoretical issues that the work responds to, a discussion of a range of positions taken by other artists or researchers to whom this work contributes a particular perspective, or some documentation of work by the author that led to the present submission, and if not, if such an omission matters;
- whether or not the submission provides new knowledge, interpretation, insights or experiences, and what (kind of) new knowledge, interpretation, insights or experiences these comprise, and if not, if such an omission matters;
- the adequacy of the methods used and the thoroughness of research, analysis and/or experiment, and if not, if such an omission matters.

[500 words maximum]

Assessment					My confidence level in assessing this is		
Outstanding	Very good	Good	Adequate	Unsatisfactory	High	Medium	Low
.....

5. Does the exposition design and navigation support the (artistic/intellectual) proposition?

Note: The design should reflect and support the artistic/intellectual proposition, while remaining understandable. The design should make sense (even if this sense might be 'confusion' at times).

Please take into account:

- if you think a correct or feasible use of referencing is used in the submission;
- in case of the use of text: the readability of the submission (including the use of written English language, if applicable);
- the length of the submission and the navigation.

[200 words maximum]

Assessment					My confidence level in assessing this is		
Outstanding	Very good	Good	Adequate	Unsatisfactory	High	Medium	Low
.....

6. Ethical and legal concerns

Are there any special ethical or legal concerns (e.g. arising from the practice with human or other animal subjects, or the use of property or copyright)?

[100 words maximum]

7. Your Conclusions

Please give your overall conclusions on this submission, highlighting strengths and weaknesses, and suggest ways to improve the submission.

[500 words maximum]

Please assign the submission an overall grade.

5 (high)	4	3	2	1 (low)
----------------	---------	---------	---------	---------------

8. Recommendations

Please provide an indication of whether you think the submission should be considered for publication in *JAR*.

The submission should be rejected.
The submission should be rejected in its current state.*
The submission should be accepted after some reworking.
The submission should be accepted.

* In this case, the artist(s)/author(s) will have the opportunity to re-submit the exposition for a second peer-review, taking into account the comments of the referees and the editor.

9. Feedback

We are curious to hear from you how you experienced writing a review for JAR and how we can improve our review process. Please give us some feedback.

Some Notes on Constructive Reviewing

As a reviewer, you represent your community and your review should be professional and constructive. The quality of *JAR* depends on the quality of reviews, which we see as more about ‘engaging’ with the work of our peers than ‘judging’ them. The job of the reviewer is to select high quality, innovative submissions for the journal, *and* to suggest ways to improve the research, as well as to uphold and/or improve on the standards of the artistic research community as a whole. A persuasive review includes a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, and the opinion of the reviewer about these.

However, it is common knowledge that the process of reviewing is itself flawed. While still ‘the best of all possible worlds’ we have to recognize some pitfalls, which might help you to produce a constructive and persuasive review.

1. **Pitfall:** Seek to find all flaws in the submission, in part to show your expertise as a reviewer.
Recommendation: Look for reasons to accept a submission. Despite its flaws, does it point in new directions or expose promising insights? The community can benefit from imperfect, insightful submissions.
2. **Pitfall:** Since the review process is anonymous, it is appropriate to criticize the submission as if the authors did not have feelings.
Recommendation: Your tone should be the same as if you are giving comments to a colleague face-to-face. It is always possible to be constructive, focus on the work, and avoid attacking the authors behind it. The purpose of a review is not only for selecting submissions, but to improve the quality of all the work in our area.
3. **Pitfall:** Advocate rejecting a submission with little comment, because it is obvious that all will agree with you. The same counts for accept.
Recommendation: Explain why you advocate a rejection or acceptance, because people will often disagree with you. Your explanations will make you a more effective advocate or detractor for the paper.
4. **Pitfall:** Advocate rejecting (almost) all submissions to show how tough you are.
Recommendation: Your job is to decide what is best which is not usually accomplished by rejecting every submission.