



Journal of Virtual Reality and Broadcasting  
University Library  
University of Applied Sciences  
Muensterstr. 156  
40476 Duesseldorf

## ARTICLE REVIEW

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Article Nr.

Title

Author(s)

Assigned Reviewer

Referee's full name  
(needed for list of outside reviewers)

Confidential comments for committee use only

Please rate the article on the presented criteria. Use the standard rating form and chose the appropriate rating for each criterion. Please, provide comments to assist the authors in improving the quality of their manuscripts.

Conflicts of Interest:

I disclose below my conflicts of interest in reviewing this manuscript:

Date

Reviewer

## ARTICLE REVIEW

### RATING

Originality

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Significance

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Technical Soundness

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Relevance

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Author

Title

Presentation

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Adequacy of Citations

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent

Referee's Expertise on the Topic

☐ novice

☐ intermediate

☐ average

☐ experienced

☐ expert

Amount of Rewriting Required

☐ very much

☐ much

☐ average

☐ little

☐ very little

### OVERALL RATING

The article is

☐ not accepted

☐ accepted with annotations

☐ accepted

Overall Rating

☐ poor

☐ needs improvement

☐ average

☐ good

☐ excellent



Journal of Virtual Reality and Broadcasting  
University Library  
University of Applied Sciences  
Muensterstr. 156  
40476 Duesseldorf

ARTICLE REVIEW

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS

Comments to the Author are a mandatory section of the review form.

Main contributions

Author \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Negative aspects

Positive aspects

Further comments

Specific comments

Page	Line	Comments
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

## ARTICLE REVIEW

### EXPLANATIONS OF THE REVIEW CRITERIA

Review criteria standardize the review process and make the result comparable. The criteria are each expressed by a keyword that summarizes their meaning. Because all reviewers should base their judgment on the same interpretation of the keywords, they have to be defined and explained. Reviewed articles are checked for originality, significance, technical soundness, relevance, presentation and their adequacy of citations. The reviewer also estimates the amount of rewriting that is required to make the article publishable and gives a statement on his or her expertise on the topic.

#### THE SCALE

A unified scale on the review items is also necessary to compare article ratings. The scale is always divided into five units, while the first represents the lowest rating, the last one the highest. The middle is just average. The lowest rating is always listed first. The units of the scale are described by words or short sentences like „poor“, „average“ or „excellent“ to help the author to choose the appropriate rating. Descriptions are less conceptual than numbers.

#### ORIGINALITY

Originality or novelty describes the innovation factor of an article. An article that covers aspects of a topic that are rarely discussed or very new has a high originality rating. The originality rating is also influenced by the fact whether an article was previously published. An article that consists mainly of old and well known material can not be considered as „original“.

#### SIGNIFICANCE

A high significance rating expresses a great impact of the article on a research topic. An article that presents important research results in a scientifically accurate way will achieve a high rating.

#### TECHNICAL SOUNDNESS

The technical soundness rating describes how the author refers to technology and its usage. References to non-existing or even non-imaginable technologies will diminish the technical soundness rating, unless the article explicitly describes new experimental tech-

nology approaches. The correct description of technical facts is also covered by the technical soundness criterion.

#### RELEVANCE

An article is relevant to jvr b if it meets at least one or more topics of the scope. The relevance rating is important because it describes whether an article fits into a journal or not. A relevant article is perceived by an appropriate audience.

#### PRESENTATION

The presentation of the article includes its readability, the use of graphical material, the language, formal aspects, and the use of technical terms. A properly structured article is easy to read and that improves the understanding of the content.

#### ADEQUACY OF CITATIONS

The adequacy of citations ratings provides information about the accuracy of references and the appropriateness of citations of an article. The references serve to support the research results but they are also helpful for the interested reader to receive deeper insight into the topic. If the references are very specialized, hard to find or on the other hand too general, the adequacy of citations rating might be quite low.

#### REFEREE'S EXPERTISE ON THE TOPIC

The referee states how deeply he or she is involved in the topic of the article. The expertise is an additional information that helps to rank the overall rating. A referee that is an expert on a topic will give a different rating on an article than referee that is a novice.

#### AMOUNT OF REWRITING

The amount of rewriting provides an overview about the number of corrections and the amount of time that is necessary to put the article into an acceptable form. If the article is acceptable with minor corrections, the amount of rewriting is „little“ (which is, in this case, a positive rating). Article that are not usable and need high effort to become publishable, will describe the amount of rewriting as „much“.