



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:

Keywords:

Reviewer's Details

Name and Surname:

Institution:

Field of study:

Report (please tick the appropriate boxes)

I. The article's structure is:

excellent

good

satisfactory

in need of improvement

unsatisfactory

II. Is the length of the article appropriate?

Yes

No

This report is archived and available on demand.

www.interculturalphilosophy.com/

info@interculturalphilosophy.com

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 ?

This report is archived and available on demand.

[www.interculturalphilosophy.com /](http://www.interculturalphilosophy.com/)

info@interculturalphilosophy.com

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.

This report is archived and available on demand.

[www.interculturalphilosophy.com /](http://www.interculturalphilosophy.com/)

info@interculturalphilosophy.com