

### Assessment procedure for reviews

In principle, reviews and collective reviews can be submitted or commissioned by the editors at any time.<sup>1</sup> In the context of a desk review, a preliminary examination of the submitted review or collective review is carried out by the editors to confirm 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).

After the editors have reviewed the manuscript, they will take their vote,

- whether the review or collective review 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.

In case of a rejection, the author will be informed about the reasons.

If acceptance is conditional, a text supervisor will be appointed. The supervisor will critically and constructively support the revision process in a mutual exchange with the reviewer.

If the supervisor is in favour of publication (if necessary, after revising the text), a final editorial review of the manuscript is carried out by the coordinator of the editors and the publisher. In the case of a final rejection, the reviewer receives a short report in which the reasons for rejection are named and briefly explained.

---

<sup>1</sup> If you are planning to submit a review that has not been requested by the editors, please send a short information about the title and planned submission date to [um.research@schott-music.com](mailto:um.research@schott-music.com) in advance.

### **Acceptance criteria for reviews**

1. The reviewed publication fits the purpose of the journal.
2. The review provides an overview of the content of the discussed text and embeds it into the scientific discourse.
3. The structure and the line of argument of the review are comprehensive and logical.
4. The reviewed publication is discussed in a factually and professionally appropriate manner and contains the reviewer's own comments.
5. Prospects for further research and/or relevance to the pedagogical praxis of music making will be discussed.
6. 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>.
7. There is neither too much personal closeness nor professional dependence between the reviewer and the author. Reviews with personal attacks and insults are rejected just as much as reviews with clearly exaggerated praise.