

Part I: Remarks regarding content

Please use this page to reflect on the contribution you have reviewed and to share your (critical) thoughts with us. How is the contribution relevant? What innovative features /elements does it contain? Can it prompt (new) discussions in translation studies/translation history or in other disciplines/fields? What theoretical or methodological questions did arise in the process of reading? What links to other research inside and outside of translation studies/translation history can be identified?

We are very much interested in facilitating an exchange of thoughts/ideas, showing the different points of view regarding the topic at hand and starting a discussion that goes beyond the exchange between reviewer, author and editors. Therefore, we would like to ask for your consent to publish your critique or outstanding parts of your comment. If you do not consent, please let us know. We would appreciate it if you would also share your motive and reasons with us, so we can continue adapting and improving our review process and journal overall.

Part II: Review of the article

1. Relevance & Originality of the Topic

Does this paper make an important contribution to translation history (and its methodological/theoretical reflection)? Does it contain novel/innovative elements? Is the paper likely to stimulate discussion in translation history/translation studies and/or beyond?

| Criterion | Outstanding | Very good | Good | Average | Poor |
|--|-------------|-----------|------|---------|------|
| Originality, Importance & Relevance of the Topic | | | | | |

Commentary:

2. Theoretical foundations

Is the chosen theoretical framework evident/convincing? Does the paper formulate relevant questions concerning the chosen topic? Does the author refer to important previous research?

| Criterion | Outstanding | Very good | Good | Average | Poor |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|------|---------|------|
| Theoretical foundations | | | | | |

Commentary:

3. Consistency of the analysis/argumentation – Research design

Is the analysis and argumentation clearly traceable and consistent (problem formulation, structure, and theses)?

Regarding empirical studies: Is it sufficiently connected to theoretical and methodological questions?

Regarding theoretical studies: Is it sufficiently connected to the empirical data?

| Criterion | Outstanding | Very good | Good | Average | Poor |
|---|-------------|-----------|------|---------|------|
| Consistency of the analysis/ argumentation; Research design | | | | | |

Commentary:

4. Style & Clarity

Is the paper well-written? Is it well-organized and clearly presented? Are (newly) introduced concepts sufficiently explained?

| Criterion | Outstanding | Very good | Good | Average | Poor |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------|------|---------|------|
| Style and Clarity | | | | | |

Commentary:

5. Final Recommendation

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| <i>Recommendation</i> | Yes |
| Accept | |
| Minor revisions | |
| Major revisions | |
| Reject | |

Commentary:

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript? Yes / No

Would you be willing to publish your peer-review discussion together with the article?
Yes / No