



BIENS
SYMBOLIQUES
SYMBOLIC
GOODS

Peer Review Form

Q1. Please state:

Your name:

Title of article assessed:

Q2. Title and abstract

The title fits the text content.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The title is clear.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The abstract fits the text content.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The abstract is clear.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

Suggestions for improvement and/or comments:

Q3. In your opinion this article:

- Presents the results of a research project.
- Is a methodological article.
- Is a theoretical/epistemological/historiographical text.
- Is an overview of a domain (literature review, state of the art, etc.) or criticism of several works.
- None of the above. (Give details below)

Please state the subject of the article (in a few lines).

Q4. Argument, source, and methodology

The subject/argument is clearly defined.

- Agree
- Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
- Somewhat disagree (edits needed)
- Disagree (complete revision required)
- Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The approach developed in the article brings something new to the domain studied.

- Agree
- Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
- Somewhat disagree (edits needed)
- Disagree (complete revision required)
- Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The methodology is outlined clearly.

- Agree
- Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
- Somewhat disagree (edits needed)
- Disagree (complete revision required)
- Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The field (in terms of sources, reference corpora, etc.) is described clearly.

- Agree
- Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
- Somewhat disagree (edits needed)
- Disagree (complete revision required)
- Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

Suggestions for improvement and/or comments:

Q5. The analysis and results are persuasive.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

Suggestions for improvement and/or comments:

Q6. Suggestions for improvement and/or general comments (please specify the strengths of the text and clearly state what, in your opinion, are its major problems and minor errors):

Q7. Bibliographic references

The bibliographic references seem to be correct.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The bibliographic references seem to have been used appropriately.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

Do you have suggestions for other references to use?

Q8. Style, form, and structure

The text is well written (in terms of spelling, syntax, punctuation, etc.).

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The text is easy/enjoyable to read.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

The text is clearly structured.

- Agree Somewhat agree (some edits recommended)
 Somewhat disagree (edits needed) Disagree (complete revision required)
 Question not applicable (if necessary, please give details below)

Do you have any comments regarding the structure and/or suggestions of changes to it? In your opinion, would certain passages benefit from being cut down or developed?

Q9. In your opinion, this article is:

- publishable in its current state publishable subject to edits (without new expertise)
 publishable subject to major changes (new expertise) unpublishable

Does any of the article need to be rewritten (in terms of style, spelling, etc.)?

Yes no

If new expertise is required, would you be willing to provide this?

yes no

Thank you for taking the time to read and assess this article.