

# 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 various sections of this form and structure your review accordingly.

There are 10 sections:

1. Reviewer self-assessment
2. Interest and relevance
3. Potential
4. Exposition of practice as research
5. Design and navigation
6. Ethical and legal concerns
7. Conclusions and revisions
8. Recommendation
9. Confidential message to the Editorial Board
10. Feedback

The questions that are asked in these 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.

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). If you have confidential notes for the editorial board, which you would prefer the author not to see, there is space in section 9 for sharing these with us. For more on constructive reviewing see Appendix A of this form.

The default practice of JAR's review process is anonymous peer review. However, if a submission is accepted, we will ask you to start the discussion with a wider public about the submission with a first comment from your personal point of view, opening up for further comments, critical readings and links to other research. 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.

JAR is an international journal that uses the English language. Spell-checking and copyediting will be carried out by experienced staff only when a submission is accepted for publication. There is no need to report back on language use during the review process.

Thank you very much!

**Submission details**

Name artist(s)/author(s):	
Title of the submission:	
URL of the submission:	
Download link:	<a href="https://www.researchcatalogue.net/research/export?research=">https://www.researchcatalogue.net/research/export?research=</a>

**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):

--

Your area of expertise: Please indicate which area/s of expertise is/are relevant to this review and how confident you are in the respective area. [Please enter area and indicate level of expertise with an x; expand table if required.]

Area	High level of expertise	Medium level of expertise	Low level of expertise

**2. Which aspects of the submission are of interest / relevance and why?**

JAR seeks submissions that address important issues or problems in an artistic manner that engages others in the field. When answering this question, please take into account the submission's subject matter, its methods, outcomes or any other aspect that you deem important.

--

### 3. Does the submission live up to its potential?

Please reflect on the potential of the submission and the way it is realised. How might the submission be improved to better match its potential?

### 4. How does the submission expose practice as research?

JAR is open to submissions from various methodological backgrounds, as long as they expose practice as research. By this we mean that the submission exposes, translates, stages, performs etc. the practice it presents so as to engage with its own meaning, to challenge existing epistemic horizons or to offer new insights.

Please take into account:

- Whether or not the submission contains a description of the question, issue or problem that is explored, 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 submission is contextualized and the context is referenced, which may include social, artistic and/or theoretical issues, and if not, if such an omission matters;
- Whether or not the submission provides new (kinds of) knowledge, interpretation, insights or experiences, and if not, if such an omission matters;
- Whether or not the submission's methodology is adequate and thorough, and if not, if such an omission matters.

Ultimately, a submission may successfully expose practice as research despite disappointing conventional academic criteria for the assessment of research. If applicable, please state where the breaching of such criteria is detrimental to the submission.

## 5. How well do design and navigation support the submission?

Design and navigation should support the proposition. Its reception should make sense and not frustrate (in the case that 'frustration' is not deemed an important element of the submission).

JAR does not operate with a minimum or maximum word count because, as a rich-media publication, we could technically accept an exposition without words. But, as a guide, we advise that a reader/viewer should be able to explore the main part of the exposition and understand the research in approximately one hour.

## 6. Are there any ethical or legal concerns?

Ethical or legal concerns may e.g. arise from the practice with human or other animal subjects, the use of property or copyright or any other issue that you may find relevant.

## 7. Your Conclusions and revisions

Please give your overall conclusions on this submission highlighting strengths and weaknesses. List revisions that should be requested and indicate if you deem them to be essential or merely desirable.

**Please assign the submission an overall grade.**

5 (high) .....	4 .....	3 .....	2 .....	1...	0 .....	(low)
----------------	---------	---------	---------	------	---------	-------

## 8. Recommendation

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. Confidential message to the Editorial Board

## 10. 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.

## Appendix A: 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 assess the quality and relevance of the submissions for the journal, and to suggest ways to improve the submission, 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 or accepting a submission with little comment, because you feel it is obvious that all will agree with you.  
**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.
5. **Pitfall:** Be less critical because you support the art that is presented.  
**Recommendation:** Even work you like can benefit from a critical reading. Show your respect for the work by engaging deeply with it and by being honest about your opinion.