**QUALITY CRITERIA**

**For original full length articles and, where applicable, other manuscripts undergoing double-blind peer-review**

A good manuscript has the following qualities

1. **Aims and scope**: the manuscript is fully consistent with the aim and scope of the journal;
2. **Rationale**: the manuscript presents a clear rationale for the study, which is motivated by a critical examination of the history of relevant research in the field (background); State-of-the-art articles must state the theoretical relevance of the topic and of the associated scholarship examined
3. **Knowledge of relevant research, concepts, terminology**: the manuscript uses updated literature, demonstrates knowledge of previous research in the field, including knowledge of appropriate concepts and terminology;
4. **Goals**: the manuscript has goals, hypotheses, research questions which are clearly articulated and motivated by the background;
5. **Method**: the manuscript has scientific depth and rigor; uses proper methodology and data and has been executed on the basis of an appropriate research design;
6. **Results**: the manuscript presents results that are relevant for current research in the field and have strong theoretical implications;
7. **Discussion**: the manuscript features a critical discussion of the theoretical implications and relevance of the results presented; the discussion sticks close to the data, background, motivation, hypotheses and research questions, and/or to the theoretical issues raised;
8. **Organization**: the manuscript has a clear focus and is well organized; it shows sufficient connection between the background, motivation, research questions, discussion;
9. **Language**: the manuscript is well-written language-wise, esp. concerning accuracy, clarity and appropriateness of style;

Manuscripts likely to be rejected in Step 2 or in Step 4 have any of the following weaknesses:

1. **Aims and scope**: the manuscript is inconsistent with the aim and scope of the journal;
2. **Rationale**: the manuscript does not present a clear rationale for the study or the presented rationale is not sufficiently motivated by a critical examination of the history of research in the field (background); State-of-the-art articles fail to reflect the theoretical relevance of the topic and associated scholarship examined, or do not examine topics of particular theoretical relevance;
3. **Knowledge of relevant research, concepts, terminology**: the manuscript does not use updated literature and/or fails to demonstrate knowledge of previous research in the field, including knowledge of appropriate concepts and terminology;
4. **Goals**: the manuscript lacks an explicit statement of the goals, hypotheses, research questions; and/or the goals, hypotheses and research questions are insufficiently motivated by the background;
5. **Method**: the manuscript lacks scientific depth and rigor; has serious flaws in methodology or research design;
6. **Results**: the manuscript presents results that are of little or no relevance for current research or have little to no theoretical implications;
7. **Discussion**: the manuscript does not feature a discussion of the theoretical implications of the results of the study or has a discussion that merely repeats the results without a critical examination of their relevance; the discussion goes too far beyond or does not sufficiently and exhaustively address the data, background, motivation, hypotheses and research questions, and/or the theoretical issues raised in the paper;
8. **Organization**: the manuscript is poorly written and poorly organized, i.e. shows insufficient connection between the discussion, data, background, motivation, research questions;
9. **Language**: the manuscript is of poor quality language-wise, esp. concerning accuracy, clarity and appropriateness of style;

**Quality criteria for manuscripts undergoing in-house review**

**A good manuscript**

1. has a clear focus and is well organized;
2. highlights the theoretical relevance of the issues raised;
3. demonstrates knowledge of previous research in the field, including knowledge of appropriate concepts and terminology;
4. is of high quality language-wise, esp. concerning accuracy, clarity and appropriateness of style;
5. strictly follows the stylesheet instructions.

**Manuscripts most likely to be rejected either in Step 2 or in Step 4**

1. are inconsistent with the aims and scope of the journal;
2. lack a clear focus, are poorly written and poorly organized;
3. fail to show the theoretical significance of the issues raised;
4. fail to demonstrate knowledge of previous research in the field, including knowledge of appropriate concepts and terminology;
5. are of poor quality language-wise, esp. concerning accuracy, clarity and appropriateness of style;
6. fail to follow the stylesheet instructions.