

Review Instructions

Dear Reviewer,

The editors of *Kairos, Evangelical Journal of Theology* highly value your scientific and professional knowledge, level of awareness and familiarity with a subject in scientific interest of journal. For this reason, I kindly ask you to review the attached paper for *Kairos*. Peer review is used to ensure that high quality science is published. It is an objective process and our reviewers play a vital role in maintaining the high standards. This is an important role as you will provide critical and constructive feedback on the work of your peers.

As a standard, the editor-in-chief will first evaluate all manuscripts. Although it is rare, it is possible for an exceptional manuscript to be accepted at this stage. Manuscripts rejected at this stage are either insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar or language, or are outside the aims and scope of the journal. Those that meet the minimum criteria are passed on for review. *Kairos* employs double blind review, where the reviewer remains anonymous throughout the process.

Reviewing a paper includes reading the paper, completing the Reviewer Report Form and Review Comments. Please provide critical and constructive comments, regardless whether your decision is to accept or to reject the paper for publication. Upon completion of the review, please send your comments to the editor. If for any reason you are unable to write a review, we ask that you inform us as soon as possible, so that we can find another reviewer.

Your comments can answer the following questions:

- Is this a topic that needs addressing in *Kairos*?
- Does the topic answer to content of article?
- Does the paper fill a gap in literature?
- Does the paper make a useful contribution?
- Are the themes relevant to *Kairos*?
- Are the themes clearly stated?
- Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the current literature in the field?
- Is the research in the paper well designed?
- Has the research been adequately and effectively analyzed?
- Are the conclusions of the paper clearly stated?
- Do the conclusions of the paper tie together all the elements of the paper?
- Is the standard of writing acceptable?

Please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail if you have any questions about the reviewing process.

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

SUMMARY SHEET

Kairos Vol.____, **No.** ____

Title of the article:_____

Reviewer:_____

Please place a check in the appropriate box.

Adequacy for publishing in Kairos	Not to be published	High modification	Small modification	Publish
Scientific contribution of article	Weak	Insignificant	Significant	Very important
Recommendation	Not acceptable	Acceptable after revision	Minor changes	Acceptable
Category	Professional paper	Review article	Preliminary communication	Original scientific paper

Date:

Reviewer's signature:
