

July 2021

# Guidelines for Reviewers

Dimensions

Journal of Architectural Knowledge

[transcript]

The peer-review is a vital element of maintaining high standards in scholarly publishing. This process could not be managed without the knowledge of specialists offering their valuable expertise. We are very grateful to all our reviewers for the time and effort they spend evaluating manuscripts for »*Dimensions. Journal of Architectural Knowledge*«.

### **General Expectations**

The journal uses a closed double-blind peer review system. Submitted manuscripts are reviewed by at least two independent experts, and the names of the reviewers are hidden from the authors, as well as vice-versa the names of the authors are hidden from the reviewers. Reviewers are asked to recommend whether a manuscript should be accepted, revised or rejected.

Although the journal uses the plagiarism detection system Cross Check, reviewers should alert the editors if they suspect any issues relating to author misconduct such as plagiarism.

Reviewers are asked to provide detailed, constructive comments that will help both the editors make a decision on the publication and the author(s) to improve their manuscript. They should point out whether the work has serious flaws that preclude its publication or to what extent the work could be supplemented or deepened.

Reviewers invited by the editors of the journal should reveal any potential conflict of interest they may have with respect to the manuscript or the authors. All likely personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest should be considered.

### **Specific Expectations**

When preparing the reports, we ask our reviewers to consider the following points:

#### **Originality and significance of the contribution**

Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and significance of the work for the scientific community. If the presented research is unoriginal and similar work has been published previously, reviewers should include that information in their feedback.

#### **Experimental or Theoretical Approach to the Discussed Problem(s)**

Reviewers are asked to discuss the novelty of the theoretical approaches and the methods used in the manuscript.

#### **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Methods, Approaches and Argumentations Used**

Reviewers should assess the appropriateness of the methods used as well as the clarity and comprehensibility of the argumentation. If needed, reviewers should suggest changes that might improve the structure, comprehensibility, methodological and argumentative conclusiveness, and clarity of argumentation of the paper.

**Coherence of the argumentation**

Reviewers are requested to comment on the coherence of the argumentation, the reliability of the methodology, and the coherence of the research approach and argumentation used in the paper. They should assess whether the conclusion(s) drawn are well supported.

**Structure of the manuscript**

Reviewers should comment whether the manuscript is easy to read and whether the arguments are presented in a logical and understandable way. They should suggest improvements, if necessary.

**Discussion of the most relevant literature on the topic**

Reviewers should comment on the relevance of literature cited in the manuscript. They should point out any important research not mentioned in the paper.

**Revisions**

When a revision of the manuscript is suggested, reviewers are asked to recommend which aspects of the work should be improved. The editors of »Dimensions. Journal of Architectural Knowledge« understand the peer review process as a procedure of constructive feedback on eye level. It is intended to enable a clear assessment of their contribution, but also to provide the authors with further advice and suggestions for their work, if necessary.

Please note that accepted papers will undergo language editing. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not constitute a sufficient reason to reject a paper if it is still intelligible for the reviewer and if its content warrants publication from a scientific point of view.

**Confidentiality**

Reviewers are asked not to distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in it without the authors' permission. However, they are free to show it to knowledgeable colleagues and to consult them about the review. Suggestions for alternative reviewers are helpful and would be appreciated.

**Technicalities**

We ask reviewers to return their reports within the specified deadline or to inform the editors as soon as possible if they are not able to do so in order to agree on a binding alternative deadline. Reviewer reports are submitted via email to the Editorial Team at the mail address of correspondence: [dimensions@bauhow5.eu](mailto:dimensions@bauhow5.eu). The Editorial Teams forwards the reports to the authors. Throughout the peer-review process, the identities of the authors and the reviewers remain unknown amongst one another, and the editors conduct all communication between them.