

Reviewers are expected to comment the articles critically, but constructively, taking into account the standards of academic writing and argumentation. They are invited to make suggestions to improve the quality of the articles, strengthening the argument and its consistency. JRFM provides the reviewers with a catalogues of questions to take into account in order to ensure that the review will provide constructive feedback to the authors:

- Are the article and its argumentation relevant?
- Does the article give an innovative, substantial contribution to the field of religion, film and media?
- Are the methodological and theoretical aspects of the article consistent with the questions it deals with?
- Which are the main positive aspects of the article?
- Which are the critical aspects of the article?
- Are there other crucial aspects that may be worth of particular attention?

Every review is expected to conclude with a recommendation by the peer-reviewer. For this purpose, the reviewer can choose one of the following options:

- I recommend that the article should be published in the present form. The article is strong, innovative and contributes in original ways to the contemporary debate.
- I recommend that the article should be published with minor revisions. It provides a very good perspective on the field and can be published with minor revisions by the author. Please clearly identify the revisions you recommend and aspects that need to be improved.
- The article should be reviewed again after substantial revision. The text is promising but cannot be published in the present form. The authors are invited to resubmit their article after substantial revisions. They are strongly encouraged to consider the suggestions made by the reviewers.
- I recommend that the article is to be rejected. The article does not fit to the profile of the journal and/or does not correspond to the required criteria.

JRFM: Code of Conduct for Peer-reviewers

Authors are esteemed as valuable partners for JRFM. Every review of an article shall be substantially justified. If necessary, constructive suggestions for improving the quality of the (rejected) work shall be provided.

The following best practice model should be applied to all reviews:

- Objectivity should be maintained throughout the review process, irrespective of the personal or professional bias of the reviewer. The reviewer may cancel his participation in the review process at any time if he considers himself to be insufficiently expert, professionally biased or personally involved.
- Although reviewers are required to critically evaluate the texts, they shall aim to provide constructive critique. Not only will their review be a suggestion for the journals editors to publish or reject a specific paper, it also should provide guidance on how it might be improved. Please mind that the author may be a younger colleague that may have less experience in publishing and is grateful for any helpful advice from seniors.
- The reviewers shall maintain full confidentiality. Neither will they discuss aspects of the review process with other persons than the editors nor will they actively try to identify the submitter of a paper. They will not take any advantages of the ideas that are discussed in the paper to be reviewed.

05 April 2017

The editors