Review of articles for Special Issues and Occasional Papers (V1.3)
double-blind peer-review (version 1.3)
Overall evaluation and recommendation for publication
*
O Accept (approval)
O Accept with reservations / conditional approval
O Reject contribution
In case of acceptance with reservations / conditional approval
Conditions for revision:
(will be forwarded to authors)
In case of rejection  Main reasons for rejection:
(will be forwarded to authors)
Originality and topicality of the question:
Is it a question that is of interest to the journal? Is a central question of the professional discourse addressed
in a personal position statement or is a clarification achieved?
*
O very good
Ogood
O with reservations O unsatisfactory
Comments and conditions for revision on "Originality and topicality of the question" to the authors
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.
Scientific character and scientific references:
Is the contribution up to date in the professional discourse, and are empirical parts methodically well
presented?
*
O very good
Ogood
O with reservations O unsatisfactory
Comments and conditions for revision on "Scientific character and scientific references" to the authors
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.
Coherence and logical structure of the contribution:
Are the main lines of argumentation in the structure of the contribution comprehensible, and are central
terms clearly defined and consistently used?
*
O very good
Ogood
O with reservations O unsatisfactory
Comments and conditions for revision on "Coherence and logical structure of the contribution"
to the authors
to the authors  Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory)
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  O very good O good
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  Overy good O good O with reservations
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  Overy good Ogood Owith reservations Ounsatisfactory
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  very good  good  with reservations  unsatisfactory  Comments and conditions for revision on "Formal linguistic level" to the authors
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  Overy good Ogood Owith reservations Ounsatisfactory
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  very good  good  with reservations  unsatisfactory  Comments and conditions for revision on "Formal linguistic level" to the authors
Reviewers must give binding conditions for revision at this point.  Formal linguistic level:  Is the contribution understandable and correctly written, and does the style follow a scientific (explanatory and argumentative) diction?  *  very good  good  with reservations  unsatisfactory  Comments and conditions for revision on "Formal linguistic level" to the authors