

## Guidelines for referees

Thank you for accepting to evaluate the potential of the attached draft/article.

We will be happy to receive your report on the text within the next 4 to 6 weeks.

When preparing your commentary, we ask you to please:

- comment on the originality of the presented work,
- evaluate the authors' approach (methodological, theoretical) in relation to the discussed problem(s),
- evaluate argumentation and conclusions,
- give a final evaluation of the work, including an explicit statement regarding whether you think we should consider it further, and, if yes, what should be added, subtracted, changed and/or transformed before publication.
- comment on style and language. Incorrect grammar or punctuation are not enough to reject a work, if its content warrants the publication from the scientific point of view. However, SRU/URS attaches great importance to style and language, and it is desirable that the report reflects this. Please indicate if you are of the opinion that the article needs certain attention to style and language.

We would also appreciate if you would consider giving us an idea of the possible impact the work in question might have, who the target audience might be etcetera.

The following observations on the role of being a referee might prove to be helpful:

1. **Expertise:** You don't have to be an expert in the precise academic field of the work in order to be a constructive referee. In fact, an excellent work will normally speak beyond its narrowly defined field. If, however, you feel that the work in question is too far off and that you do not feel qualified to judge its merits, please return it to us and we will find another referee.
2. **Confidentiality:** A referee is asked to evaluate an unpublished work, so confidentiality is of paramount importance until the work is published. It is preferable that a referee destroys all electronic and printed copies of the draft work and of the referee report once s/he has received confirmation that the report is duly delivered. Referees must not disclose to others which papers they have refereed; nor are they to share those papers with any other person.
3. **Conflict of Interest:** A Referee must declare any conflict of interest or any other factor which may affect hers or his objectivity and judgement- for example, if asked to evaluate a paper of a colleague or an intellectual opponent. In cases of conflict of interest, please notify us as soon as possible, so that we may find another referee.
4. **Intellectual Merit:** A paper must be judged on its intellectual merits alone. Personal criticism or criticism based on the political or religious views of the referee are not acceptable.
5. **Full Explanation:** Critical or negative judgments must be supported by explicit reference to (quotes) the work under review or other relevant sources.
6. **Plagiarism and Copyright:** If a referee considers that a paper may contain plagiarism or that it might breach another party's copyright, they should notify the publishing manager, providing the relevant citations to support the claim.

Looking forward to your report.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us at SRU/URS

Sincerely,

*Mats Rosengren*

Mats Rosengren  
Editor-in-Chief of SRU/URS

Professor of Rhetoric  
Department of Literature  
Uppsala University

E-mail: mats.rosengren@littvet.uu.se