

## Peer review

All manuscripts of academic papers and artistic research presentations submitted to the AAVV are first reviewed by the issue editor and/or the AAVV Editorial Board to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with the [AAVV Guidelines for Authors](#) and whether they are eligible for peer review. If the quality of the manuscript is inadequate, or if it is not in keeping with the theme of the issue or the direction of the journal, the editor may either reject it without peer review, or ask the author to revise or supplement the manuscript, stating the deficiencies. In the event of a breach of research or publication ethics, the editor will contact the Editorial Board for further action.

Manuscripts submitted to the AAVV undergo single-blind peer review, i.e. the identity of the authors is known to the reviewers, but the identity of the reviewers is not disclosed to the authors, unless otherwise requested by the reviewers themselves. In order to ensure a smooth and high-quality peer review process, and the necessary anonymity, and to avoid the dissemination of unpublished manuscripts during the peer review process, the AAVV issue editors, the Editorial Board, and others involved in the preparation process are required to adhere to the requirements of publishing ethics and the [AAVV Guidelines for Editors](#).

### The review process

- The editor submits the manuscript for peer review within 1 week from the date of receipt of the manuscript. Sometimes the search for suitable reviewers may take longer if the article deals with a very specific and very little researched topic.
- Each manuscript is assessed by at least two reviewers. The editor of the issue and the authors of other manuscripts submitted for publication in the same issue are not eligible as reviewers. No more than two manuscripts submitted for the same issue may be reviewed by the same reviewer.
- The editor or the Editorial Board shall select the reviewers on the basis of their expertise in the field of research and their knowledge of the subject. The reviewer of an academic paper must have a PhD degree; the reviewer of an artistic research presentation must have a PhD degree or be a recognised artist.
- The timeframe for the reviewer to submit his/her review is between 2 and 4 weeks. Reviews should be written on approved AAVV review forms, which are chosen according to the language of the manuscript (English or Lithuanian) and the type of paper (academic or artistic research).
- The reviewer sends the completed review by e-mail to the editor of the issue or to the responsible member of the Editorial Board who has contacted the reviewer in the beginning of the process.
- In the event of conflicting reviews (one reviewer recommends to reject the manuscript and the other recommends to accept, to accept after minor revisions or reconsider after major revisions), a third reviewer will be sought by the editor, or

the manuscript will be read and assessed by one of the members of the Editorial Board for additional review. If two of the three reviewers, or one reviewer and the responsible member of the Editorial Board, recommend that the manuscript be rejected, it shall be rejected.

- Reviews are sent to the author only after both reviewers have given their assessment, and in the case of contradictory reviews, after a third assessment.

## **Reviewer guidelines**

- Alert the editor and/or the Editorial Board to any potential personal, financial, professional or other conflict of interest and refuse to review the manuscript if there is a possibility of such a conflict.
- Maintain the confidentiality of the peer review process: do not share, discuss or disclose the information contained in the manuscript under review or its components (e.g., abstract, summary) to third parties, do not publish or communicate your review to third parties without the consent of the Editorial Board, and do not send your review to the author.
- Do not cite in your own work, publish or otherwise disseminate the unpublished manuscript submitted to you.
- Provide your evaluation on the AAV review form sent by the issue editor or the Editorial Board, following the guidelines given therein. Even if you have reviewed manuscripts for the AAV in the past, use only the review form sent by the editor along with the particular manuscript, as the forms may be updated.
- Additional comments can be made in the manuscript if necessary: make sure they are anonymised or ask the editor of the issue to do so.
- Avoid any clues or comments in the review that could lead the author of the manuscript to assume your identity. If, for some reason, you wish to reveal your identity to the author, please arrange this with the editor of the issue or the Editorial Board. At the request of the reviewer and with the agreement of the editor and the Editorial Board, the identity of the reviewer may be disclosed if it would contribute significantly to the quality of the manuscript or to further public academic debate.
- Please write your review in the language in which the manuscript was submitted to you, regardless of the nationality of the author.
- Please try to evaluate the submitted work as fully as possible, taking into account the evaluation criteria below. Please justify your comments, both critical and supportive.
- Avoid personal comments, arrogant, insulting, ridiculing or demeaning language in your review. Criticism of the text is necessary, but it should be reasoned and constructive, respectful and in the tone of scientific debate.
- Please respect the agreed terms and conditions of peer review. Please inform the editor immediately if unforeseen circumstances mean that it will not be possible to complete the review on time.

## Criteria of assessment

- Take the following aspects into account in your review:
  - Explicitness of theses and objectives
  - Research significance and comprehensiveness
  - Relevance of theoretical discourse
  - The expediency of research methodology and data
  - Adequacy of scholarly and other sources
  - Validity of conclusions
  - Consistency of structure and argumentation
  - Quality of language and style
- If you are reviewing a presentation of artistic research, please note that the research practice in the submitted work can be successfully revealed even without the usual academic parameters. If applicable, please state where the breaching of such criteria is detrimental to the submission.
- Check the [Guidelines for AAVV Authors](#) and make sure that the manuscript that receives a positive review meets the publisher's standards.
- After evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript, suggest ways to improve it, if possible, and give your recommendation: A. Accept; B. Accept after minor revisions; C. Reconsider after major revisions; D. Reject.
- Express to the editor and/or the Editorial Board any allegations of breach of research and publication ethics, for example:
  - the manuscript is obviously similar to a manuscript already published or submitted for publication elsewhere at the same time;
  - you suspect that not all the researchers or specialists who have made substantial contributions to the research or the manuscript have been acknowledged, or that the authors include researchers who have not contributed to the study or whose contribution is unsubstantial;
  - you have noticed plagiarism, inaccurate citations or unattributed quotations from the work of other researchers;
  - the manuscript contains repetitive factual errors, misleading unsubstantiated statements, manipulation of data, or unethical collection or use of data;
  - the language of the manuscript is offensive, derisive, humiliating or discriminatory, or contains personal criticism directed at other researchers rather than their research;
  - you have observed other violations of research and publication ethics.