

## Review procedure for papers

In principle, papers can be submitted or can be commissioned by the editors at any time. In the context of a desk review, a preliminary examination of the submitted manuscript is carried out by the editors to confirm the fit to the underlying purpose and thematic orientation of the journal *üben & musizieren.research*. The review or collective review will also be examined based on the criteria catalogue on which the journal is based (see below). A decision is made promptly as to whether the manuscript should undergo peer review or be rejected. In case of a rejection, the author will be informed about the reasons.

If the manuscript is approved for review, the editors will ask two expert reviewers to review the manuscript based on the journal's criteria catalogue (see below). Unlike the single-blind procedure, in which the author is blind to who is reviewing the text, and the double-blind procedure, in which the author and the reviewer are blind to each other, the *üben & musizieren.research* review procedure does not use any anonymization. This is done in favour of a critical-constructive procedure that intends a principally appreciative, scientifically founded exchange between author and reviewer consciously aiming to increase the quality.

After the reviewers have examined the manuscript, they take their vote,

- whether the text can be published without changes to form and content and as submitted,
- whether the manuscript can be published without re-examination after minor revision,
- whether the manuscript should be revised with regard to the points of criticism risen by expert votes and then re-examined for acceptance,
- whether a rejection is to be issued.

Particularly in the case of a negative assessment of the manuscript, the reviewers should endeavor to provide constructive and comprehensible reasons for the points of criticism. The submitting authors should be able to continue working on the improvement of their text on this basis.

If the text is evaluated inconsistently, the editors will decide on its (conditional) acceptance (if necessary, with the help of a third-party reviewer). In addition, the editors can, on the basis

of the reviews, decide that a revision is necessary, even if the reviewers have come to a different final result.

If acceptance of the text is conditional, the process of revision is supported by the reviewers in a critical and constructive exchange with the author and at the request of the editors. The revision process by the author only starts after they have received the reviewer's feedback from the editors. The editors can add further comments and suggestions to the feedback.

If both reviewers are in favour of publication (if necessary, after revising the text), the coordinator among the editors and the publisher will conduct a final editorial review of the manuscript. The reviewers will be named in the publication.

In the case of a final rejection, the author receives a short report in which the reasons for rejection are named and briefly explained.

### **Criteria for acceptance of papers**

1. The content is aligned with the concept of the journal.
2. The relevance of the question(s) or problem statement(s) for the pedagogy of music making is convincingly shown.
3. The theoretical framing is done sufficiently under (critical) consideration of the national and international discourse in the research and/or professional field praxis. The question(s) or problem statements are developed from the topic-specific state of art in the field.
4. The subject matter, the question(s) or problem statements as well as the aim of the contribution has to be written in a clear and comprehensive manner.
5. The structure and the line of arguments of the paper are comprehensive and logical. The individual parts of the paper are appropriately weighted with regard to the question(s) or problem statement and the aim.
6. The research methodological approach is clearly stated, sufficiently justified and reflected upon, and is acknowledged as fit for purpose for the research interest.
7. The results are presented in a coherent and comprehensive manner and are discussed appropriately in relation to the state of art in the field.

8. The results contribute to the constitution of the field or provide new insights for the research on the pedagogy of music making. Perspectives for further research and/or for the pedagogical praxis of music making are discussed.

9. The paper complies formally as well as linguistically with the standards of good research practice; see also the DFG's Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3923602>.