Scientific Criteria for Reviewers

section miniatures

Miniatures are suitable to initiate discussions about history education in a broader sense. They can include suggestions and ideas for educational innovations, new theoretical concepts, cross-cultural research, interdisciplinary approaches etc. The contributions must address the objective of the journal.

Miniatures can address theoretical (reviews, critical essays, etc.) and empirical issues (material-oriented papers in which the results of studies, text analyses, experiments, evaluations, meta-analyses, etc. are reported and discussed).

For both text types the same criteria apply to a large extent. Only in the area of ‘suitability of methodological approach and quality of implementation’ do only two of the eight criteria apply to theoretical papers (3.1 and 3.8). The six criteria that apply exclusively to empirical work (3.2 to 3.7) are specially marked.

Reviews should be worded benevolently and offer the authors clear options for a potential revision of their contribution. In the case of a rejection, the shortcomings should be made explicit.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of the article** | Please add the title of the article |

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  I hereby confirm that there are no conflicts of interest or competing interests. See the [editorial policies and publication ethics](https://eterna.unibas.ch/htce/policies) for more details. |

# 1. Relevance, actuality, and originality/innovative quality

Is the relevance, actuality and originality/innovative quality of the contribution clearly and plausibly presented?

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  yes |
|[ ]  partially |
|[ ]  no |

For further feedback for the author, please use these key points as a guide:

1.1 Significance of the contribution for the topic under discussion and the thematic context.

1.2 Actuality of the theses or results presented.

1.3 Originality of the contribution (opening, extension, or new accentuation of scientific discussions; novel methodological approach).

|  |
| --- |
| **Comment and necessary changes:**Please add comments and specify necessary changes |

# 2. Quality of the theoretical background

Does the theoretical background correspond to the current state of research?

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  yes |
|[ ]  partially |
|[ ]  no |

For further feedback for the author, please use these key points as a guide:

2.1 Explicit presentation of the scientific and/or conceptual frame of reference.

2.2 Reception of the current state of research on the topic (national and international research; theoretical concepts as well as former empirical findings).

2.3 Determination of a knowledge desideratum or research gap, formulation of an appropriate research question or thesis.

2.4 Deepening of the problem and clarification of the terms used.

2.5 A dialogue between different knowledge domains (transnational, transcultural, science and practice, etc) is initiated.

|  |
| --- |
| **Comment and necessary changes:**Please add comments and specify necessary changes |

# 3. Suitability of the methodological approach and quality of implementation

Does the methodological procedure, the interpretation and the evaluation of the results meet current quality criteria?

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  yes |
|[ ]  partially |
|[ ]  no |

For further feedback for the author, please use these key points as a guide:

3.1 Appropriateness of the approach to the question under consideration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3.2 Transparent description of the methodological procedure****3.3 Comprehensible presentation of the data basis****3.4 Use of appropriate procedures, precision, and systematics in data evaluation****3.5 Clear and appropriate presentation of results****3.6 Relation between presentation and interpretation of results****3.7 Discussion of the validity of the results and any limitations** | Criteria 3.2. to 3.7 are suitable for empirical articles. |

3.8 Discussion of the implications of the results for educational practice and further research.

|  |
| --- |
| **Comment and necessary changes:**Please add comments and specify necessary changes |

# 4. Structural and argumentative coherence, formal correctness

Is the contribution clearly structured, does it meet the formal requirements, is the language correct (as far as can be judged based on one’s own language abilities)?

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  yes |
|[ ]  partially |
|[ ]  no |

For further feedback for the author, please use these key points as a guide:

4.1 Coherence of the global organization of the text, meaningful structure, and coherent relationships between the different parts of the text.

4.2 Recognizability of the ‘red thread’, coherence of the argumentation

4.3 Linguistic quality (spelling, grammar, style...)

|  |
| --- |
| **Comment and necessary changes:**Please add comments and specify necessary changes |

# 5. Further comments, further reasons for acceptance or rejection, global assessment

|  |
| --- |
| Please add further comments and global assessment |

# Decision

Overall, I recommend the following decision:

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  Accept submission |
|[ ]  Revisions required |
|[ ]  Resubmit for review  |
|[ ]  Resubmit elsewhere |
|[ ]  Decline submission |

**Please, turn in this reviewer form to the HTCE Journal via using your HTCE User account.**