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**Rate your overall response to this project**

\_\_\_\_ I strongly recommend publication.

\_\_\_\_ I recommend publication but offer some suggestions for revision.

\_\_\_\_ I recommend that the project be revised for further consideration.

\_\_\_\_ I do not recommend publication.

**Review Criteria**

1. Originality and soundness of research

Is the article based on original research and/or does it propose new arguments, and does it make a solid contribution to scholarship in the field?

1. Clearly articulated thesis

Is the thesis of the article clearly stated, and are the conclusions convincing and well supported?

1. Evidence of awareness of the literature on the topic

Does the article reference the previous research/literature on the topic? Are there any important sources that have been overlooked?

1. Transparent methodology

Does the author clearly articulate their approach?

1. Clear and adequate language and effective use/selection of images

Is the writing clear and comprehensible? Do the images support the main argument and are they adequately discussed in the article?

1. Relationship between the article and digital component

Does the author demonstrate how the production of digital tool(s) and/or feature(s) will lead to a scholarly argument’s key points (either by enhancing the depth of insight or making it possible) and/or will illustrate aspects of that argument in dynamic and interactive ways? Are all proposed aspects of the project’s digital component necessary to making the proposed interpretive claim(s)?

**Suggested revisions**

What suggestions do you have for revising the article? Although we are primarily concerned with your thoughts on the article, we would also welcome any thoughts you have on revising the digital component of the project. No matter what your opinion of the project is, the author as well as the editors of *NCAW* will be extremely grateful for any constructive criticism you can provide. We see the peer review as a productive process that helps the author to develop and improve their project.

*Please send your comments to*

 DAH editor Carey Gibbons (dah\_editor@19thc-artworldwide.org)

 **Thank you for your support of *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide!***