**Technoetic Arts: Guidelines for Reviewers**

Thank you for agreeing to review this article. The following sections may help you in providing feedback to the author.

Drawing from academic research and often unorthodox approaches, *Technoetic Arts* is a peer-reviewed journal that explores the juncture of art practice, technology and the human mind, opening up a forum for trans-disciplinary speculative research.

We are thankful for all reviewers who engage in providing constructive feedback to the authors. Even if the article is rejected, your comments may result in greatly improved resubmissions, or new submissions, to this journal or other journals at a later date. We thank you in advance for your assistance. The peer-review system is critical to the quality of academic journals.

The Technoetic Arts Editorial Organism supports the proper recognition of all our reviewers. You will receive a ‘thank you for your review’ email from the system that you can forward to the [Web of Science Reviewer Recognition Service](https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-publishing-solutions/reviewer-recognition-service/) (formerly publons.com) or similar services. Please contact us at [editors@technoeticartsjournal.org](mailto:editors@technoeticarts.org) for any further clarifications or support.

**In step three of the review process in the online journal system, you will be asked to enter your review into a text field. You may copy-paste all of the sections below. In addition, it would be helpful if you could upload the file in the upload section.**

**TITLE OF THE PAPER:**

**FAMILIARITY WITH THE SUBJECT MATTER**:

[ ] Very familiar

[ ] Familiar

[ ] Less familiar

**CONTENT**

**What are the main objectives and contributions of this paper?**

**Do the paper and its focus reflect the content and scope of the journal and/or thematic call?**

**Considering its content, is the length of the article appropriate and in line with the guidelines of the journal?** The article should be between 5000 and 7500 words.

**Do the title, abstract and keywords reflect the content of the article adequately?**

**SIGNIFICANCE AND ORIGINALITY**

**Is the significance of this research clear?**

[ ] Very clear

[ ] Clear

[ ] Less clear

**To which extent does it contribute to the development of the subject?**

[ ] Strongly

[ ] Fairly

[ ] Scarcely

**To which extent is existing literature taken into consideration?**

[ ] Strongly

[ ] Fairly

[ ] Scarcely

**How would you rank the paper in terms of its originality?**

[ ] High

[ ] Medium

[ ] Low

**CLARITY OF ARGUMENT**

**Is the argument coherent and clear?**

[ ] High

[ ] Medium

[ ] Low

**How comprehensible and relevant is the paper to an interdisciplinary readership?**

[ ] High

[ ] Medium (could benefit from additional explanations)

[ ] Low (language is not clear or uses too much discipline-specific jargon)

**Is the argument adequately supported by references?** We would like to raise the quality of the writing. Please indicate if there are issues with the referencing. Is important scholarship in the field mentioned?

[ ] Strongly

[ ] Fairly

[ ] Scarcely

**WRITING AND FORMATTING**

**How good are the organisation, sentence structure, spelling, figures, and tables?** We would like to raise the quality of the writing. Please indicate if there are issues with the structure and/or the writing. We would prefer articles with a good flow to the text that are enjoyable to read.

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good (but should be corrected)

[ ] Poor (needs substantial improvements)

**Does the article need to be proofread by a native English speaker?** We would like to raise the quality of the writing. Please indicate if there are issues with language and writing and if the article is not yet publishable.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

[ ] Not sure

**Does the paper satisfy the style requirements specified in the Technoetic Arts author guidelines** [**(referencing style, preferred spelling, images etc.)**](https://www.intellectbooks.com/journal-editors-and-contributors)**?**

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good (needs minor improvements) Please specify:

[ ] Poor (needs substantial improvements) Please give a short explanation:

**SUGGESTIONS TO AUTHOR(S) FOR IMPROVING THIS PAPER:**

**This is an essential point. Please provide the authors with constructive comments on how to**

- extend the argumentation:

- elaborate the article for an interdisciplinary readership:

- include further additional references:

- or how to improve the paper in any other way:

**RECOMMENDATION**

**After due consideration, can you please choose one of the following recommendations for the editor:**

[ ] Accept

[ ] Accept after minor revision

[ ] Major revision, resubmit for review

[ ] Resubmit elsewhere

[ ] Decline submission