

Guidelines regarding peer review of manuscripts

Nordic Journal of Educational History (NJE_{Ed}H) strives for high scientific quality. Every submitted manuscript that the editorial team finds thematically motivated and scientifically applicable will be subjected to blind appraisal by two reviewers. The reviewers are selected based on their competence in the specific field which the manuscript deals with, or their solid general competence within the wider field of educational history. NJE_{Ed}H utilizes the principal of double blind review.

In an overall assessment of the manuscript, reviewers are requested to consider the following general guidelines:

- **Scientific merit: Are the methods, theories and empirical evidence that is presented in the manuscript of relevance as regards to its purpose, aim and results? Does the results of the study seem credible?**
- **Originality: Does the manuscript contribute new knowledge to the field? Is a relevant dialogue with current and past research achieved and is the author able to position the study in relation to earlier research?**
- **Relevance and thematic extension: Do the results presented seem significant for the advancement of the field of educational history?**

These guidelines may in turn be broken down into six more detailed questions:

- **Is there an updated and relevant overview of earlier research included in the introductory part?**
- **Are there satisfactory arguments for the article's scientific merit included in the introductory part?**
- **Is there an adequate discussion about source material and method?**
- **Is the source material adequate and relevant in relation to the research question(s)?**
- **Is there a reasonable amount of theoretical reasoning/hypothesis?**
- **Does the manuscript give satisfactory and credible conclusions in relation to the research question(s) and the cited source material?**

It is important that reviewers give constructive comments and that the feedback include not only general criticism, but also provides the author(s) with concrete ideas for improvement. To facilitate the review process, please use the tools "Comment" and "Track Changes" on the "Review"-tab in MS Word.

The final assessment of a manuscript is communicated through one of the following options:

1. **Recommend publication**
2. **Recommend publication after minor revision**
3. **Recommend major revision and new peer-review**
4. **Recommend rejection**