

Date

Dear Colleague,

Thank you for your promise to review an article that has been submitted for the online research journal of the Finnish Theatre Research Society. The theme of the publication (Näyttämö & Tutkimus x) is xxxxxx. Please find enclosed information on the process, as well as two evaluation forms.

Please note that we ask you to submit *two* forms, of which the first one is only for the editors. The second one will be sent to the writer. *So, please do not write on it any recommendations on whether the text should be published or not.*

### **Some Guidelines for Evaluation**

Please try to be constructive in your criticism and give as detailed feedback on the weaknesses and strengths of the research article. Feel free to correct the language and orthography. However, this is not compulsory. As editors, we naturally appreciate if you devote some of your time on this, too.

Instead of pointing out isolated mistakes, we hope that you focus on the reasons why this article deserves to be published in spite of its possible imperfections.

Please send your evaluation by **xxxxxxx** to **xxxxxxx**

The editors of this publication are, xxxxxxxx (email), xxxxxx (email) and xxxxxx (email). We are all happy to answer any questions that you might have on the article, the publication, or the evaluation process.

Thank you for your valuable contribution!

Evaluation Form for Peer Reviewers

Name of the Publication

Title of the Article:

Name of the Reviewer:

The review is based on both the reviewer's and the writer's anonymity.  
If you allow your name to be revealed to the writer, please indicate it here:

Yes:    No:

**To the Editors:**

Please use the following scale (1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = average, 4 = sufficient, 5 = weak)

*Merits of the Article:*

Focus:

New information and/or fresh viewpoints:

Use and scope of previous research in the same area:

Sufficiency of source materials:

Use of source materials:

*Results:*

Clarity in presenting the results:

Achieving the goals:

New information on the topic:

Contribution to the discussion in the field:

*Methods*

Are the methods presented clearly?

Are the methods suitable for this particular research?

Are the methods used appropriately?

Are there new methodical innovations?

*Style:*

Orthography:

Clarity:

Logic of argumentation:

Structure of the article:

*Recommendations:*

\_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable for publication

\_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable with minor corrections (details below)

\_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable as a shorter version

\_\_\_\_\_ Acceptable in other format (for example, an essay)

\_\_\_\_\_ Re-writing and new evaluation needed

\_\_\_\_\_ Not suitable for this publication (but might be considered in another one)

\_\_\_\_\_ Not acceptable

*Additional comments:*



## Evaluation Form for Peer Reviewers

Name of the Publication

**Title of the Article:**

**Comments to the Writer:**