

## Review Form Sheet

Paper title:

Please return the completed review form before

### I. Content

1. Does the topic of the paper belong to the scope of HYLE? Y / N  
 If not, please suggest a more appropriate journal, and skip the following.
2. Please evaluate the main theses by using a scale between 1 and 5:
  - *new, innovative, and original* (1) or *well-known and documented* (5):
  - *interesting and thought provoking* (1) or *boring* (5):
  - *important for the philosophy of chemistry* (1) or *marginal* (5):
3. Is the overall argumentation: *straight forward, conclusive, persuasive, plausible, spongy, incomplete, incomprehensive, inconsistent?* (Please circle one or many as appropriate.)
4. Are all parts of the argumentation sufficiently clear? Y / N  
 If not, please indicate such passages in the manuscript with *ARG*.
5. Are the main concepts introduced with sufficient clarity? Y / N  
 If not, please indicate the corresponding terms in the manuscript with *CPT*.
6. Are pertinent publications on the same topic considered in the discussion? Y / N  
 If not, please give references on a separate sheet.
7. Is the text flawless in detail (no mistaken formulas, incorrect quotations, wrong chemical or historical data, etc.)? Y / N  
 If not, please indicate errors in the manuscript with *ERR*.

### II. Structure & Readability

1. Is the text coherently structured without unnecessary excursions leading astray? Y / N  
 If not, please indicate such excursions in the manuscript with *EXC*.
2. Is the text consequently ordered corresponding to the main line of argumentation? Y / N  
 If not, please suggest a better order in rough terms of the text's paragraphs, if possible:
3. Is the text comprehensible both by philosophers and chemists, given each have some interest and basic knowledge of the other field? Phil.: Y / N  
Chem.: Y / N
4. Are unnecessary technical details avoided or appended? Y / N  
 If not, please indicate in the manuscript with *TEC*.
5. In general, is the text *too lengthy, too concise, or appropriate* to its content? (Please circle.)

### III. Formal Aspects

1. Does the title of the paper correspond to its content? Y / N
2. Do abstract and keywords summarize the main topics and theses? Y / N
3. Are illustrations and figures (incl. captions) *instructive, confusing, superfluous* or *required*?  
Please circle as appropriate, and list problematic figures here:
4. Is the text linguistically & grammatically correct, or does it need *slight corrections* or *considerable revision*? (Please circle.)

### IV. Overall Recommendation

- 1. Acceptance
  - a) without change
  - b) with slight changes
  - c) with considerable changes
- 2. Resubmission of completely revised paper
- 3. Rejection

In case of 2 or 3, please provide the main reasons of your decision: .....

.....

Please write any comments that you feel not covered by the items above on a separate sheet.

**Please use the following symbols to indicate flaws in the margins of the manuscript:**

- ARG:* *flawed argumentation*
- CPT:* *unclear concept*
- ERR:* *error*
- EXC:* *excursion leading astray*
- TEC:* *technical details without necessity*
- ?* *any other lack of clarity*

Return to:

**HYLE**  
**Institute of Philosophy**  
**University of Karlsruhe**  
**D-76128 Karlsruhe**  
  
**GERMANY**