

Journal of Sound and Music in Games – Review Template

The editors extend their sincere thanks for your willingness to review the manuscript for the journal. Peer review is essential to the quality of academic scholarship and we appreciate the considerable energy and time investment that reviews demand. Whatever the outcome of the review, your comments will provide valuable advice for the author(s).

Please indicate your assessment of the submission using the criteria outlined below. The definitions listed for each category are general characterizations and you may find that a submission sits across multiple categories. Please provide specific information in your comments to indicate how the submission aligns with your assessment. Where appropriate, please suggest how the submission may be improved. You are welcome to annotate the manuscript, but this is not required. If any of the following prompts are not applicable to the submission, please indicate that this is the case ('N/A') along with your reasoning.

1. Please assess the significance of the research findings presented in the submission.

Poor	Weak	Neutral	Good	Excellent
No distinct conclusions are presented by the submission, or the relevance of the findings are unclear.	The outcome of the research is ambiguous, or the conclusions redundantly duplicate existing knowledge.	Submission presents interesting conclusions, but it is limited, either by tending toward descriptive reporting, or providing only a small amount of new or novel information.	Submission presents notable research findings that advance understanding and/or are likely to inform future research.	Submission presents significant research findings that represent a major contribution to knowledge.
Comments:				

2. Please assess the quality of the presentation (in terms of organization, clarity, and length).

Poor	Weak	Neutral	Good	Excellent
The structure is difficult to discern and the space is poorly utilized, perhaps through insufficient detail, or unnecessary material. The research conclusions are not successfully communicated to the reader.	The presentation (linguistic or otherwise) lacks clarity. The submission's length, either through brevity or redundancy, is not well-suited to the communication of the research.	The structure of the submission is serviceable, though the organization, language, or length may not be optimal for communication of the research to readers.	The submission communicates the research findings clearly and precisely, with only occasional lapses in the quality of communication. The article's length is appropriate, though there may be minor areas of redundancy, or sections that would benefit from further elaboration.	The submission presents the research clearly and precisely, in a readily-comprehensible format that is appropriate for the conclusions.
Comments:				

3. Please assess the submission's relationship with the broader scholarly landscape.

Poor	Weak	Neutral	Good	Excellent
The submission does not engage with other scholarship, or does so only in a superficial way. The level of citation may be inappropriately sparse. The lack of scholarly engagement or contextualization undermines confidence in the submission's conclusions.	The submission ignores important pertinent scholarship that is likely to significantly alter the research conclusions. Important claims require further research and/or citation. Scholarly engagement is limited or uncritical.	The engagement with scholarship is limited, perhaps by relying on a small selection of sources, or focusing inappropriately narrowly on one approach or disciplinary tradition. Some claims require further support, and their legitimacy may have some bearing on the conclusions presented.	All significant pieces of relevant literature have been identified and are utilized appropriately. Any further scholarship recommended by reviewers would enrich the argument, but are unlikely to alter its conclusions. The research is well-supported by appropriate citation.	The research is effectively situated within a scholarly landscape. The submission demonstrates full command of the discourse in this area. The level of citation is entirely appropriate. Any supplementary scholarship suggested by reviewers would not alter the fundamental argument or findings.
Comments:				

4. Please assess the methodology of the submission.

Poor	Weak	Neutral	Good	Excellent
The methodology is not clear, or is mismatched with the claims made. The conclusions reached are insufficiently supported by the research.	The methodology is often ambiguous, which causes concerns for the robustness of the conclusions drawn. There is a lack of clarity in the reported evidence.	There are ambiguities concerning some of the less significant aspects of the research process. Overall, the conclusions are soundly supported by evidence.	Even if the methodology is not explicitly addressed in the submission, the research process is clear and well-matched to the conclusions, providing confidence in their validity.	An appropriate, clear methodology provides well-described evidence that supports robust conclusions.
Comments:				

5. Please consider the submission's appropriateness for the *Journal of Sound and Music in Games*.

Poor	Weak	Neutral	Good	Excellent
The research is only tangentially or tenuously connected with the scope of <i>JSMG</i> .	The submission is on the periphery of <i>JSMG</i> 's scope.	The research is within <i>JSMG</i> 's remit, though it may be of limited relevance or comprehension to a significant proportion of the readership.	The research is clearly within the scope of <i>JSMG</i> . It relies on readers to have highly specialized discipline-specific knowledge.	The research perfectly fits the scope of <i>JSMG</i> and is accessible to a diverse readership.
Comments:				

General comments:

Overall recommendation:

Accept without revision	
Accept with minor revisions, as detailed above	
Revise and invite resubmission for further review	
Reject	

Ethics of review for authors and reviewers:

We trust that all reviewers and authors will maintain appropriate ethical standards of professionalism when producing and reviewing manuscripts. We aim to adhere to the best practice outlined by COPE in this respect. In particular, we would like to draw **both** authors' **and** reviewers' attention to our request that they:

- Treat peer review as confidential. Authors and reviewers should not reveal any details of the review, during or after the peer-review process, apart from those that are released or explicitly permitted by the journal.
- Inform the editors if there are any factors that become evident after submission of the article or review that may affect the recommendations, feedback or conclusions.
- Maintain a constructive, professional tone in providing reviews and responding to reviews. Raise any concerns or questions with the editors who will be very happy to provide advice.