Reviewer Guidelines

Archaeologia Austriaca is a peer-reviewed journal. The editor, the board and editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the author and reviewers (including potential reviewers). Ten members of an international advisory board and the members of the local editorial board consisting of leading members of the Austrian Archaeological Institute of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAI) and the Institute of Prehistory and Historical Archaeology of the University of Vienna (IUHA) help the editor in her / his search for and choice of external international reviewers.

Peer review

At least two positive external reviews are required for an article to be accepted for publication. Reviewers are asked to return their reviews within 6 weeks. They must not show or discuss the contents of the manuscript with others. Reviewers are expected to express their opinions objectively. Reviewers should avoid statements damaging to the author's reputation. Criticism should be directed against the work, not the author. The anonymity of the reviewer is guaranteed. Invited reviewers should not review manuscripts when there is a positive or negative conflict of interest. Reviewers are considered to be biased if they have published and/or cooperated with the author(s) in the past five years, if they have been represented on professional and regularly meeting committees or have worked at the same research institution; if they have fundamental scientific differences of opinion with the author(s); if there are other personal and/or professional relationships between them (e. g. supervision relationships) that could give the appearance of bias towards uninvolved third parties. If there are circumstances of bias or conflicts of interest, please inform the editorial office (archa@oeaw.ac.at).

Reviewer questionnaire

1 What is the scientific aim of the contribution work? Has it been achieved?

2 Does the paper meet the state of research content-wise and scientifically?

3 Does the work present new and important findings? (Novelty or other value)

4 Do title and abstract correspond to the content of the article?

5 Does the structure of the paper follow a logical sequence with introduction, data presentation, discussion and conclusion?

6 Is the work worthy of publication?

7 Suggestions for improvement

8 Are all illustrations scientifically relevant?

      8.1 Do some images have to be reproduced in colour from a scientific point of view?

9 Editorial aspects

     9.1 Did you notice spelling errors and / or typos?

10 Do you consider the contribution as an article or a report?

Reviewer recommendation (check one)

Publish   □

Publish with minor modifications   □

Major rewriting required
The revisions have to be reviewed once more by the expert   □

The revisions do not have to be reviewed again by the expert   □

Reject   □