Instructions for peer reviewers / December 2017

Journal profile
The journal *Nordisk Museologi* (Nordic Museology) is a forum for theoretical and topical debate on heritage and museological subjects within the field covered by Nordic museums and related professional fields. The editors welcome articles from authors from different professions and institutions and with different approaches to the entire museological field. Manuscripts are assessed from an editorial point of view by the national editors in Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Norway and Finland. Languages used in the journal are Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and English.

We request a brief review from you – one page only should suffice.

In order to make the most of your comments and suggestions we have drafted a series of questions for you to consider when assessing the article in question:

- **Relevance** – do you think that the article’s subject suits the journal profile?

- **Research question** – does the article have an expressed aim that is addressed throughout the text, leading to a conclusion?

- **Structure and content** – is the structure in keeping with academic traditions? Is the article too long, or short? (The maximum size for articles is 7,000 words.) Would the article benefit if parts of it were omitted? Or do you have suggestions that would otherwise strengthen the article?

- **Form** – does the article adhere to the journal’s style guide provided for authors (notes, references, bibliography etc.)? [http://www.nordiskmuseologi.org/guidelines.html](http://www.nordiskmuseologi.org/guidelines.html)

- **Language** – is the article comprehensible, coherent and understandable for the non-initiated? Does it live up to academic standards?

- **Comprehensive evaluation** – please comment on the article’s strong and weak points. If necessary – suggest improvements, and kindly write them with the author in mind (not the editors). Is it eligible for publication? (The decision whether to publish the article or not, rests entirely with the editors. But we value your opinion on this matter.)

The review process is double blind.
We hope that our reviewers will give the article in question a new assessment after its revision.
As a sign of our appreciation we will send you a copy of the journal, regardless of whether the article has been accepted or not.

We thank you in advance for assisting us on this matter and we look forward to receiving your review.

The Editors