

Guidelines for reviewers

Peer Reviewer Responsibilities

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in the field of Music Business Research. Please provide respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors concerning their submission. Please discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

The Review

When reviewing an article, please keep the following in mind:

(1) Content Quality and Originality

Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal's standards? Is the research question an important one? If the research has been covered previously, please pass on references of those works to the editor.

(2) Organisation and Clarity

- Title: Does it clearly describe the article?
- Abstract: Does it reflect the content of the article?
- Introduction: Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately? Does it clearly state the problem being investigated?
- Method: Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these procedures ordered in a meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Was the sampling appropriate? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded? Has the author been precise in describing measurements?
- Results: This is where the author/s should explain in words what he/she discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted. Are the statistics correct? If you are not comfortable with statistics, please advise the editor when you submit your report. Interpretation of results should not be included in this section.
- Conclusion/Discussion: Are the claims in this section supported by the results? Do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?
- Tables, Figures, Images: Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand?

(3) Scope - Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?