

Reviewers are expected to comment articles critically and constructively, taking into account the standards of academic writing and argumentation.

They are invited to make suggestions to improve the quality of an article, strengthen its arguments, and its consistency. JRFM provides reviewers with the following guiding questions to take into account in order to ensure that the review will provide constructive feedback to the authors:

- Are the article and its topic relevant?
- Does the article offer an innovative, substantial contribution to the field of religion, film and media?
- Are the methodological and theoretical aspects of the article consistent with the questions it deals with?
- Does it offer a convincing argument?
- Which are the main positive aspects of the article?
- Which are the problematic aspects of the article?
- What are your suggestions for revisions (if needed)?
- Are there other crucial aspects that may be worth of particular attention?

Every review is expected to conclude with a recommendation by the reviewer. For this purpose, the reviewer can choose one of the following options:

- I recommend that the article should be published in the present form. The article is strong, innovative and contributes in original ways to the contemporary debate.
- I recommend that the article should be published with minor revisions. It provides a very good perspective on the field and can be published with minor revisions by the author. Please clearly identify the revisions you recommend and aspects that need to be improved.
- The article should be reviewed again after substantial revision. The text is promising but cannot be published in the present form. The author is invited to resubmit the article after substantial revisions. The author is strongly encouraged to consider the suggestions made by the reviewers.
- I recommend that the article be rejected. The article does not fit with the profile of the journal and/or does not correspond to the required criteria.

JRFM: Code of Conduct for Peer Reviewers

Authors are highly esteemed partners of JRFM. Every review of an article shall be substantially justified. If necessary, constructive suggestions for improving the quality of the (rejected) work shall be provided.

The following best practice model should be applied to all reviews:

- Objectivity should be maintained throughout the review process, without any personal or professional bias of the reviewer. The reviewer may withdraw from the review process at

any time if they consider their expertise as insufficient, or if they are professionally biased or personally involved.

- Although reviewers are required to critically evaluate the texts, they are expected to provide constructive critique. Their review provides a recommendation for the journal editors to publish or reject a specific paper, and should also provide guidance on how the paper might be improved. Reviewers are asked to keep mind that the author may be a younger colleague with less experience in publishing who is grateful for any helpful advice from senior colleagues.
- The reviewers shall maintain full confidentiality. Neither will they discuss aspects of the review process with other persons than the editors nor will they actively try to identify the author(s) of a paper. They will not take any advantage of the ideas are discussed in the paper under review.

February 1st, 2022

The editors