**Explanation of Metrics**

1. **How original is the main argument of the manuscript?**

A good manuscript has a main argument, which in turn must contain more than what is already covered in existing research on the topic. In a philosophical manuscript this may involve an original line of reasoning, a fresh interpretation of an important passage, or a new connection between two texts or authors.

The reviewer’s task is to determine the extent to which the author succeeds in going beyond what is already covered in existing research on the topic.
2. **How thoroughly does the manuscript examine the philosophical problem at issue?**

The journal seeks manuscripts that attempt to examine a philosophical problem as thoroughly as possible. However, the reviewer must not conflate the *complexity* of the discussion of a philosophical problem with the *depth* of its treatment, the latter of which is more difficult to attain.

The reviewer’s task is to determine how well the author has managed to uncover the essence of the philosophical problem in question without losing focus.
3. **How well does the manuscript contextualize itself within existing research on the topic?**

As has been explained in (i), a good manuscript features a main argument that contains more than what is already covered in existing research on the topic. Considering this, the author must be able to *contextualize* their work within existing literature, especially in the same language the article is written. That is to say, the author must be able to explain in what ways the manuscript contains what is already covered in the literature and in what ways it differs from existing research on the topic.

The reviewer’s task is to determine the extent to which the author has managed to contextualize their manuscript within existing research, which is only possible if the author is sufficiently conversant with the relevant literature.
4. **How clearly does the manuscript distinguish its main argument from more peripheral claims?**

One of the distinguishing marks of good manuscript is the extent to which the author succeeds in distinguishing their *main argument* from more *peripheral claims*, the latter of which may also be necessary—and sometimes even be of great philosophical significance. Nevertheless, a well-written manuscript aids the reader in clarifying the question of in what passages, exactly, the manuscript deviates from its central theme.

In light of these, the reviewer’s task is to determine how focused the manuscript is—i.e., to determine how clearly the author manages to distinguish its main argument from more peripheral issues.
5. **How successful is the author in backing up their claims with textual evidence and argumentation?**

It is important that the specific claims made by the author are argued for and not merely stated. To this end, the author can back up their claims by making use of textual evidence drawn from primary texts and/or secondary literature. Likewise, the author can provide an original line of reasoning that helps substantiate the thesis in question.

The reviewer’s task is to determine how well the author has managed to substantiate their specific claims by developing a novel argument and/or by making sufficient use of textual evidence.
6. **How appropriate is the use of philosophical concepts in the manuscript?**

In a philosophical manuscript, an important problem is the inappropriate use of potentially ambiguous terms (e.g., there is general confusion about the precise meaning of “a priori,” “intuition,” and “imagination”), for which reason the author needs to disambiguate their use of these concepts. Likewise, terms popularized by a particular philosopher, such as *Ding an Sich* or *Dasein*, are likely to pose a similar problem; the author therefore needs to specify the sense of the term at issue operative throughout the manuscript.

In light of these, the reviewer’s task is to determine the extent to which the author has managed to employ a clear and consistent use of the philosophical terms contained in the manuscript.
7. **How appropriate are citations to existing literature on the topic?**

In order to develop a novel thesis, the author needs to be sufficiently conversant with the relevant literature. It is especially important in this context to display conversance with scholarly works that are written in the same language that the manuscript itself is written in. Note, however, that superfluous citations are not considered an asset; each citation needs to contribute in some way to the manuscript, for otherwise the reviewers and/or the editorial board may decide that the manuscript merely feigns conversance with the literature.

The reviewer’s task is to determine whether the existing literature pertaining to the area of research is sufficiently covered with respect to the specific context of the main argument of the manuscript.
8. **Is the manuscript well organized, well-paced, and clearly written?**

A manuscript that is organized effectively clarifies both how the main problem addressed by the author has been treated by other philosophers and how this manuscript in particular contributes to existing literature. Authors should state at the beginning of the manuscript how each section of the paper will help substantiate their specific claims. An effective introduction that takes these into account will therefore both inform the reader at the outset whether the manuscript lies within their sphere of interest and enable the reader to follow the manuscript’s narrative with ease. Accordingly, the manuscript should feature a well-defined structure wherein parts clearly contribute to the whole, and the conclusion of the paper must further aid the reader in bringing this narrative to the fore.

In this vein, the reviewer’s task is to determine whether the manuscript features a coherent narrative and, if need be, to advance constructive criticisms that will help improve the structure of the manuscript