**Review Form**

**Atrio. Journal of Art History**

Atrio. Journal of Art History, with e-ISSN: 2659-5230, is a scientific publication of the Art History Area of the Department of Geography, History, and Philosophy at Pablo de Olavide University, published since 1988 with an annual frequency. It was created with the aim of publishing original and unpublished studies on Cultural Heritage and Art History, with historical, critical, aesthetic analyses, etc., in any field and era, both in Spain and Latin America. It is aimed at the community of researchers, educators, and scholars in these disciplines.

To ensure quality, all articles will undergo scientific review, first by the editorial team and secondly by two reviewers through a “double-blind system.” This means that for the assessment of each manuscript, the report from two experts is mandatory. Their evaluation will be binding for decision-making, and in case of disagreement, the editorial team may request a review from a third evaluator.

Reviewers, while avoiding any possible conflicts of interest arising from reviewing each article, will adhere to confidentiality regarding the author and the evaluated work, as well as objectivity in their arguments, judgments, and observations.

Reviewers will have one month to evaluate the assigned article. To do this, they will need to submit their report through the OJS platform, assessing, based on four ratings (very good, good, fair, or poor), sixteen different sections that evaluate the quality of the work, its suitability, and relevance. After providing comments that justify their decision and making the necessary corrections, they will need to choose from some of the following options, the meanings of which are included to facilitate the choice of each:

* Accept: the article is accepted for publication without the need for changes.
* • Publishable with modifications: the article is accepted for publication, but the author will be asked for a series of changes.
* • Resubmit for review: the reviewer considers that relevant changes are necessary, which the author will need to make, followed by another round of peer review.
* • Resubmit to another publication: the reviewer considers that the text does not fit the journal's policy and recommends submitting it to another publication.
* • Not publishable: the submission has not passed the peer review and is not recommended for publication in the journal.

Additionally, the reviewer can upload files for the editor and/or author to consult, including the revised versions of the original review file(s).

Manuscript review should assess whether studies include a sex and/or gender disaggregated analysis, and whether they address its relevance to the research design, results, discussion and limitations.

In the following pages, the review form for manuscripts *for Atrio. Journal of Art History* is included.

**Review Instructions**

**MANUSCRIPT:**

* The methodology described for the research work is clear and concise.
* The conclusions are supported by the results obtained.
* If figures and tables are included, they provide additional information and are not repeated in the text.
* If applicable, financial supports and/or funding are declared.
* To ensure compliance with perceptual quality requirements, no references to the author have been included in the document, nor any other data that could compromise the blind peer review and reveal the identity of the author.

1. **Evaluation**

The title clearly reflects the object and subject matter of the article\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The abstract and keywords easily show the subject matter of the article\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The structure of the paper is adequate and allows an apt understanding of the topic\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The objectives are clearly and concisely stated\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The methodology used is adequate\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The theoretical foundation is appropriate and adequately stated\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The use of documentary sources is rigorous\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Bibliography is timely and up to date\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Ideas and arguments are rigorously stated\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Reflects results/conclusions with clarity and good argumentation\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Figures and tables are convenient\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Not applicable

Formal aspects such as grammar are correct, spelling, etc.\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The study is original, interesting, novel and current\*

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Inclusive language is used.

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

The research has been designed taking into account the sex/gender variables.

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Not applicable

Evaluation of the academic contribution of the article

☐ Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

**2.- General assessment of the content \***

**3 Suggested modifications or corrections \***

**4.- Reasons for rejection (fill in if considering the article as not publishable)**

**5.- Do you accept that your name and institution appear in the general list of reviewers? Your name will not be linked to the reviewed work. You can see the list at the following link:** [**https://www.upo.es/revistas/index.php/atrio/evaluadores-as**](https://www.upo.es/revistas/index.php/atrio/evaluadores-as)**\***

Yes

No

**Recommendations**\*  
☐ Accept  
☐ Publishable with modifications  
☐ Resubmit for review  
☐ Resubmit to another publication  
☐ Not publishable

**Reviewer**  
Name and surname:  
Institution:  
Email:  
Date sent to reviewer:  
Date of evaluation and submission to the journal:

*The items marked with an asterisk are mandatory*.