

Guide to reviewers of articles submitted to JAMH

The following are some guidelines that may assist reviewers.

- Has the topic or site of investigation been previously documented in similar detail, or is this a new area/topic of investigation or an old one with important additional material?
- What are the major claims of the paper?
- Are the claims novel?
- Will the paper be of interest to others in the field?
- Will the paper influence thinking in the field?
- Are the claims convincing? If not, what further evidence is needed?
- Are there other aspects that would strengthen the paper further? How much would they improve it?
- Is the manuscript clearly written? If not, how could it be made more accessible?
- Could the manuscript be shortened to aid communication of the most important findings?
- Are any included figures and images relevant and clear ?
- Are the findings of the research appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature
Does the interpretation/discussion assess the historical aspects in a different or novel approach?
- Is the article suitable for publication in its present form (apart from minor corrections and typographical errors)?
- If the article is not suitable for publication in its present form, can it be revised to meet requirements and can you suggest how it could be improved?