# *Central Europe Yearbook*

# Rubric

TITLE OF ARTICLE\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. RATING(high)1 2 3 4 5 (low)

Contains innovative information \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

 Shows responsible scholarship \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

 Evidence of familiarity with subject \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

 Pertinence of subject to the journal \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

 Style, format, organization \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_

2. RECOMMENDATION

 \_\_\_\_ Accept with revision

 \_\_\_\_ Revise and resubmit

 \_\_\_\_ Not acceptable for publication

3. COMMENTS (please attach additional sheets if needed):

Referee: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Referee Guidelines

1. RATING

Contains innovative information: Does this article make a significant contribution to the literature, or does it mostly repeat information already published elsewhere? Does it present innovative or creative insights, opinions, or syntheses? New factual or survey data?

Shows responsible scholarship: To what extent has the author explored and assimilated the literature that is relevant to his/her topic? Is the thesis explained or justified; is it well thought out; does it recognize and deal with opposing viewpoints or counter-arguments; is it based on, or does it include misinterpretations or misstatements? In other words, does it merit the attention and respect of those who may not agree with it?

Evidence of familiarity with subject: Do incompleteness, lack of clarity, or misunderstandings mar the presentation? Is the author in command of the topic as a whole and the level at which it is being addressed?

Pertinence of subject: Is the topic likely to be interesting or meaningful to a significant proportion of the journal’s diverse readership, which includes professional historians, dedicated amateurs, and general readers of varied levels of expertise? Although it has a Central European focus, will it also be of interest to many readers outside the area?

Style, format, organization: Is the article either too elementary or too esoteric? Too sweeping/generalized/superficial? Too narrowly focused? Is the presentation logical, well organized, easy to follow, grammatical, literate? Are there places where it is hard to be sure of what the author is trying to say? Is the writing style either too casual for a formal publication or too complex to be pleasant to read? Might the article be more clear or useful if given a different structure: e.g., chronological, topical?