

# Human Figurations

Long-term perspectives on the human condition

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your commitment to the publication of high quality peer-reviewed publications in *Human Figurations*. The unifying theme of the journal *Human Figurations* is a broad concern with long-term processes of the development of human society and the human condition and the journal invites submissions from a wide range of disciplines and on a variety of subject matters. The editorial can be found at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0001.101/--editor-s-introduction-long-term-perspectives-on-the-human?rgn=main;view=fulltext> which outlines clearly the editorial board's approach to the journal.

Your role as a reviewer for *Human Figurations* is primarily that of an arbiter or a judge but you may also be invited to participate in the discourse(s) to which the enclosed paper refers based on your comments. *Human Figurations* will be publishing commentaries on selected papers, especially those that are likely to take debates in a new and fruitful direction.

Before you start the review, let me remind you of the aims of the journal. The readership of the journal is intended to be *multidisciplinary*. The theme of the journal is outlined above and we seek to publish *fresh and innovative approaches* and cutting-edge scholarship on all topics relevant to long-term processes of the development of human society and the human condition. We also encourage *debate and dialogue*. Above all, we invite authors to undertake *critical inquiry*.

After reviewing the enclosed paper, please provide your assessment in terms of the questions posed below. These questions are derived in part from the aims of the journal cited above. This page of the review is our concession to orthodoxy.

The more important part of the review is your comments to the author(s) on the ideas, concepts, and theses presented in the paper. Please use your own style in writing these comments: we are loathe to impose a structure of any kind. The only request we have is that your comments are accessible and jargon-free. Beyond this, you should view your comments to the author as part of a *constructive dialogue*. We have included here some general guidelines that will enable you to assess the quality and content of the anonymous article sent to you. Please return a completed Word version of this to Clare Spencer ([adhjournal@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:adhjournal@hotmail.co.uk)) along with any other comments that you would like to include. You should feel free to increase the space provided to you below.

**Compared to submissions to comparable journals with which you are familiar, how would you rate the article in terms of:**

	Top 10%	Top 25%	Top 50%	Lower 50%	Lower 25%
Contribution to the literature/knowledge in the area					
Innovation and creativity					
Quality of argument					
Clarity of expression					
Overall view					

**Do you consider that the subject matter of this paper has a particular disciplinary perspective?**

Yes      If so, what perspective is employed and how?

Possibly      Please comment further

No or inappropriate      If not, please comment further

**Recommendation**

Accept

Minor Revision

Major Revision

Revise and Resubmit

Reject

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

Yes

No

**Comments**

Confidential Comments to the Editor (if any)

Comments to the Author

