Peer review form for Chronotopos

Research articles undergo double-anonymous peer review by two independent reviewers. Please treat the manuscript and report confidentially and contact julia.richter@univie.ac.at with questions. Procedure: https://chronotopos.eu/cts/about#peer-review. Updated 5 November 2026.

Part I: Remarks regarding content

Please use this page to reflect on the contribution you have reviewed and to share your (critical) thoughts with us. How is the contribution relevant? What innovative features /elements does it contain? Can it prompt (new) discussions in translation studies/translation history or in other disciplines/fields? What theoretical or methodological questions did arise in the process of reading? What links to other research inside and outside of translation studies/translation history can be identified?

Review reports are confidential and are not published automatically. Direct exchange with authors, disclosure of identities or publication of a report requires the prior explicit agreement of everyone involved. Participation is voluntary; refusal does not need to be explained and does not affect the publication decision.

Part II: Review of the article

1. Relevance & Originality of the Topic

Does this paper make an important contribution to translation history (and its methodological/theoretical reflection)? Does it contain novel/innovative elements? Is the paper likely to stimulate discussion in translation history/translation studies and/or beyond?

Criterion	Outstanding	Very good	Good	Average	Poor
Originality, Importance & Relevance of the Topic					

Commentary:

2. Theoretical foundations

Is the chosen theoretical framework evident/convincing? Does the paper formulate relevant questions concerning the chosen topic? Does the author refer to important previous research?

Criterion	Outstanding	Very good	Good	Average	Poor
Theoretical foundations					

Commentary:

3. Consistency of the analysis/argumentation – Research design

Is the analysis and argumentation clearly traceable and consistent (problem formulation, structure, and theses)?
Regarding empirical studies: Is it sufficiently connected to theoretical and methodological questions?
Regarding theoretical studies: Is it sufficiently connected to the empirical data?

Criterion	Outstanding	Very good	Good	Average	Poor
Consistency of the analysis/ argumentation; Research design					

Commentary:

4. Style & Clarity

Is the paper well-written? Is it well-organized and clearly presented? Are (newly) introduced concepts sufficiently explained?

Criterion	Outstanding	Very good	Good	Average	Poor
Style and Clarity					

Commentary:

5. Final Recommendation

Recommendation	Yes
Accept	
Minor revisions	
Major revisions	
Reject	

Commentary:

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript? Yes / No

Would you be willing to publish your peer-review discussion together with the article?
Yes / No