**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 sections of this form and structure your review accordingly.

There are 9 sections:

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

Please refer to Appendix A for further information regarding these sections should you find yourself unsure of how to respond.

The questions that are asked should be considered as a guideline for your review. Please feel free to deviate from them should you think your review requires that. Please write in the document beneath the question taking as much space as you require.

When you formulate your assessment please take into consideration that what you write may anonymously be sent to the author(s).If you have confidential notes for the editorial board, which you would prefer the author(s) not to see, there is space in section 7 for sharing these with us. For more on constructive reviewing see Appendix B of this form.

As JAR is a rich media, online journal, if not provided by the author(s), there is no pdf version to download and print. However, in order to read text offline, you can download the complete submission using the link provided. Note that some submissions contain large videos and that you will require sufficient memory space on your computer.

JAR is an international journal that publishes in English, Spanish, Portuguese, French and German. 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.

Please return this form via email to Julian Klein, JAR’s peer review editor, at *julian.klein@jar-online.net*

Thank you very much!

**Submission details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the author(s): |  |
| Title of the submission: |  |
| URL of the submission: |  |
| URL for download: |  |
| RC editor(s) used: |  |

**Reviewer details**

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

**0. Reviewer Self-assessment and reviewing environment**

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



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 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The computer interface you used during the assessment of the submission: Please indicate screen size (desktop or mobile devices), headphone use, printouts etc.



**1. 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 intellectual property or copyright, incidences of plagiarism or any other issue that you may find relevant. In this section you may also note any ethical concerns about use of language or approaches that may impact marginalized communities based on ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, ability, or age, among others.



**2. 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).



**3. 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 a submission may articulate its contribution in a variety of manners, artistically as well as academically. Please note any perceived shortcomings here, while keeping in mind that a submission may successfully expose practice as research despite not adhering to conventional academic criteria for the assessment of research.



**4. Has the potential of the submission been sufficiently developed?**

Please reflect on the potential of the submission and the way it is realized here. If you have suggestions for the author(s), please list them in section 6 of this form ‘Conclusions and Revisions.’



**5. 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 and any other aspect that you deem important.



**6. 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.



How substantial do you believe possible revisions to the submissions are, where 0 = no revisions and 10 = fundamental rework is required?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| no revisions |  |  |  |  |  | fundamental rework |

**7. Confidential message to the Editorial Board**



**8. 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: The questions on this form, further explained**

Please refer to the JAR submission guideline <https://jar-online.net/en/submissions>, JAR’s approach to peer-reviewing <https://jar-online.net/en/peer-reviewing-and-artistic-research> as well as JAR’s publication ethics <https://jar-online.net/en/publication-ethics> should you have questions regarding general aspects of the process.

**0. Reviewer Self-assessment and reviewing environment**

One of the peer-reviewers of each submission may be drawn from a pool of possible reviewers provided by the author(s). Reviewer suggestions may reflect personal relationships, they may also be guided by perceived shared interests. Knowing an author’s work even outside the submission can add value to a review as long as there is no conflict of interest. However, please be aware that it is only the submission that is to be reviewed, not an author’s work as a whole.

JAR often receives inter- or transdisciplinary submissions. We aim to find reviewers with expertise in all relevant fields. It is not expected that reviewers feel competent with regard to all aspects of a submission. If you feel a lack of expertise affects your response to any aspects of the exposition, please indicate this in your responses to the questions below.

JAR assumes that the experience of viewing, listening to or reading an exposition will influence your interpretation of it. Given the wide range of devices that reviewers may use (regarding screen size, human-computer-interactions, sound quality etc.), it is important for us to be informed of the specific setting in which a review has taken place.

**1. Are there any ethical or legal concerns?**

Please refer to JAR’s publication ethics page: <https://jar-online.net/en/publication-ethics>

JAR is aware that many artists tackle difficult problems at times transgressing registers of taste etc. Rather than applying a set of rules across the board, we ask reviewers to help assessing whether aspects of a submission may be offensive, while understanding that this is an ongoing conversation that invites various opinions, case by case.

JAR is committed to non-discriminatory inquiry, research, and practice. We strive to have an inclusive and diverse publication practice and deem it important to be sensitive to the reception of research in different cultural contexts. We ask for your expertise in addressing problematic positions that may emerge in the review process.

JAR operates within the [Research Catalogue’s Terms of Use,](https://www.researchcatalogue.net/portal/terms) which forbid the uploading of any content which is unlawful or which infringes the rights of others, including copyright and observing generally accepted codes of research ethics. Please indicate any elements where you believe the RC’s Terms may have been breached.

**2. How well do design and navigation support the submission?**

JAR considers the form of a submission to be as important as its content. In our experience criticism can easily overlook the appearance or the modes of articulation that are employed, thus failing to consider the more subjective aspects of an encounter. As you move through a submission, you may want to reflect on the development of your affective responses and ask whether or not they add to or subtract from your understanding. As you do this, please keep in mind that negative feelings, too, can be productive.

JAR as well as the Research Catalogue operate within a very open framework with very few standards of how the tools that are available are to be used. Different submissions can vary greatly, and it is best to assume that many details are by choice of the authors. However, while authors ‘design’ their submissions as web pages on the RC, you should not expect professional web design but rather spatial and temporal layouts and guidance through them that make sense to you.

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.

**3. How does the submission expose practice as research?**

The notion of ‘exposition’ is central to JAR’s approach to artistic research. It is used to highlight the fact that each submissions needs to make a case for how artistic practice can count as research. While there are standards that many authors have adopted from academia, there is also a long history of art in which various strategies have been developed, albeit often outside narrow definitions of knowledge.

Thus, you may want to 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 not adhering to conventional academic criteria for the assessment of research. If applicable, please state where the breaching of such criteria is detrimental to the submission.

**4. Has the potential of the submission been sufficiently developed?**

Expositions of artistic practice as research can surprise, but they can also disappoint. As you are going through an exposition you may find yourself excited by the project but let down by aspects of the research or by specific choices taken for the submission. During the review, revision and production stages of a submission, JAR aims to realize as much as possible of a project’s exciting potentials in the exposition itself.

Given the role of subjectivity mentioned above, we want to invite reviewers to report here on the vision for a submission that has arisen while navigating it as well as on associations they deem important.

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

Responses to this question will help further developing the focus of a submission. After having looked at the submission in more detail, with this question, we ask you to reflect on a submission’s contribution to a field or fields of research.

**6. Your Conclusions and revisions**

If a submission is accepted for publication, an editorial assessment will be provided to the author(s) that reflects on the opinions of the various reviewers. Your responses to this question will help drawing up a list of mandatory or optional revisions.

Note that it is fine to state the issues that you think authors should address before publication without describing how these should be addressed. In the light what is said above (3. How does the submission expose practice as research?) there may be more artistic or more academic responses to the shortcomings that you have identified.

The scale (0-10) for the amount of possible revisions that you think are required represents JAR’s assumption that most, if not all, artistic practice may successfully be exposed as research. It is thus less a choice between ‘accept’ and ‘reject,’ from a peer-reviewers or an editor’s perspective, and more to do with interests shared with authors as well as the conditions and the labor required to further develop a submission. The JAR editorial board will look at your report and evaluation closely, and use it as a basis to decide which submissions to take forward into publication based on which requirements.

**Appendix B: Some Notes on Constructive Reviewing**

As a reviewer, you represent your community, and your review should be professional and constructive. The quality of JARdepends 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 support a submission. Despite its flaws, does it point in new directions or expose promising insights? The community can benefit from imperfect, insightful submissions.

1. **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 to select submissions for publication, but also to improve the quality of all the work in our area.
2. **Pitfall:** Advocate publishing a submission with no revisions or advocate a fundamental rework, with little comment, because you feel it is obvious that all will agree with your opinion.
**Recommendation:** Explain why you have strong views on the submission in the knowledge that people will often disagree with you. Your explanations will make you a more effective advocate or detractor for the submission.
3. **Pitfall:** Advocate fundamental reworks for (almost) all submissions to show how tough you are.
**Recommendation:** Your job is to decide what is best, which is not usually accomplished by dismissing every submission.
4. **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.