

MPR Review Procedure

1. The first author sends a submission by email to the Editor. The Editor may reject the submission outright if it does not relate to one of the topics addressed in the journal (see http://mpr-online.net/about_this_journal.html) or does not follow the guidelines for contributors (see http://mpr-online.net/pdfs/MPR_Guidelines.pdf).
2. Within two weeks the Editor passes the submission to the member of the Editorial Board whose expertise corresponds most closely to the discipline of the submission and who then becomes the Action Editor for the manuscript.
3. Within the next two weeks the Action Editor chooses two reviewers, sends them the abstract, checks that there is no conflict of interest and asks if they would like to review it. The reviewers will normally be experienced researchers from relevant disciplines. They are asked to submit their reviews within six weeks of receiving the manuscript.
4. The Action Editor checks that the reviews fulfil the guidelines provided to reviewers (if not, the reviews will be returned to reviewers for revision). S/he then forwards the reviews in their entirety with a draft cover letter to the Editor.
5. The Editor approves or revises the cover letter and sends it back to the Action Editor.
6. The Action Editor then sends the reviews and the cover letter to the first author.
7. The first author revises the manuscript if necessary and returns it with a letter detailing how the reviewers' comments have been addressed.
8. When the Action Editor is satisfied that all the reviewers' comments have been addressed satisfactorily that any further revisions s/he deems necessary have been made and that the manuscript is correctly formatted for publication, s/he forwards the revised manuscript with the replies to the reviewers' comments to the Editor.
9. The Editor (or person appointed by him) rechecks all documents, has galley proofs prepared, and forwards these to the Action Editor.
10. The Action Editor forwards these documents to the first author for a final check before the manuscript goes to press, with confirmation that publication can go ahead to be given within one week.
11. The electronic version is published on the website.

Notes:

- The Action Editor keeps a record of the dates on which each step in this procedure is completed and ensures that undue delays are prevented.
- Other members of the Editorial Board may be approached by Action Editors to provide reviews, but an Action Editor cannot also review the same manuscript.
- These procedures are subject to change without notice and the Editor reserves the right to change the procedures to deal with unexpected situations.

Review Guidelines

The Editors wish to prevent any conflict of interest between reviewers and authors. If you believe that there may be a conflict of interest, please alert the Action Editor before completing this form.

Name of reviewer:

Date:

Title of paper:

| | inadequate | acceptable | good | excellent |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to music | | | | |
| 2. Relevance to music performance | | | | |
| 3. Academic quality | | | | |
| 4. Presentation | | | | |
| 5. Title | | | | |
| 6. Abstract | | | | |
| General | | | | |

| | Low | Medium | High |
|---|------------|---------------|-------------|
| Reviewer's expertise in the area of the paper | | | |

| RESULT | | |
|---|--|--|
| Publish without revision | | |
| Publish with minor revisions | | |
| Return to the author for major revisions and review again | | |
| Reject | | |

1. Our definition of "music" includes all cultures, styles, genres, functions and contexts.
2. Please consider the extent to which the the topic explicitly relates to music performance. One useful, if imprecise, indicator is whether, and how often, terms such as "performer" or "performance" appear in the text and how the approach presented extends scientific insight into music performance.
3. Please consider originality, theoretical and practical significance, and methodological rigour, according to the usual standards of your specific sub-discipline.
4. Please consider language, readability, concision, structure and organization, use of figures and tables, and accessibility for an interdisciplinary audience.
5. The title should accurately reflect the content and include the main keywords.
6. The Abstract should present background, aims, main contribution and implications. Every point in the Abstract should be expanded upon in the paper.

COMMENTS: The primary aim of your comments should be to help the author(s) to improve the academic quality of their submissions and to prepare their final copy. Please, therefore, write in a friendly, helpful style, carefully avoiding personal, emotional, sarcastic or otherwise potentially offensive language.