



## Reviewer Report

*InterCultural Philosophy, Journal for Philosophy in its Cultural Context* (hereafter the Journal) uses a double-blind review procedure; neither the author nor the reviewer know each other's identity. This process is used in order to maintain the reliability of the review process. The Journal uses a thirteen-point feedback form only as an extension of the review process. The reports are archived and made available on demand to supervisors and faculty members.

Title of the Article: [Click here to enter text](#)

Keywords: [Click here to enter text](#)

### Reviewer's Details

Name and Surname: [Click here to enter text](#)

Institution: [Click here to enter text](#)

Field of study: [Click here to enter text](#)

---

### Report (please tick the appropriate boxes)

#### I. The article's structure is:

**excellent**

**good**

**satisfactory**

**in need of improvement**

**unsatisfactory**

This report is archived and available on demand. The copyrights rest with the editorial team.

[www.interculturalphilosophy.com](http://www.interculturalphilosophy.com) / [info@interculturalphilosophy.com](mailto:info@interculturalphilosophy.com)

**II.** Is the length of the article appropriate?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**III** Is the number of tables suitable for the length and nature of the text? Are the tables and text redundant?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**IV** Title, Abstract, and Keywords are:

excellent .

adequate .

inadequate .

satisfactory .

unsatisfactory .

**Which, if any, are inadequate and require any changes?** Click here to enter text

**V** The article deals with issues that are clearly linked to the volume's topic:

**Yes** .

**No** .

**VI** Is the research up-to-date and timely?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**VII** Is the adopted method effective in achieving the article's intentions?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**VIII** Are the arguments put forward in the article, in general:

**convincing** .

**unconvincing** .

**well-developed** ?

**satisfactorily developed** ?

**unsatisfactorily developed** ?

**IX** Is the discussion consistent with the results or does it overstate the implications and/or significance of the results?

**The Former** .

**The Latter** .

**X** Is there any evidence of plagiarism?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**If yes, please indicate where:**

**XI** Should the article be accepted:

**without any changes** ?

**with minor changes** ?

**with substantial changes** ?

**XII** Should the article be accepted at all?

**Yes** .

**No** .

**XIII** Please write your critical comments to justify your opinion:

Signature, Date:

## **Review Criteria**

Each reviewer should indicate whether the article is suitable for publication in the Journal. There are three major criteria:

- whether the article falls within the scope of the Call for Papers,
- whether the article falls within the scope and guidelines of *InterCultural Philosophy* in general,
- whether the article uses sound scientific methods,
- whether the submitted article is of a quality that warrants publication.

## **Reviewer Responsibilities**

Reviewers are to avoid all conflicts of interest. If you are invited to review a paper for which you believe there may be a conflict of interest, e.g., you identify the author as a colleague or student notwithstanding the double blind reviewing, please bring this to the attention of the editors immediately. If you feel that you are not qualified to review a particular manuscript, or are qualified to review only certain aspects of a manuscript, please advise the editor as soon as possible. Manuscripts are to be treated as confidential documents. They are not to be shared or discussed with colleagues or students and are not to be delivered to any other third party. The Journal asks the reviewers to indicate their rating and opinion regarding the quality of an article. The feedback form is meant as an extension of the review process. The reviewer is not obliged to fill it out. Although the Journal abides by the double-blind review procedure, it remains at the discretion of the editors to release reviewer reports to any interested parties.