

## INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS

Many thanks for accepting to review this article submitted to the *Journal of Energy History / Revue d'histoire de l'énergie*.

This journal operates a double blind review process. All contributions will be initially assessed by the editors for suitability for the journal. Papers deemed suitable are then typically sent to a minimum of two independent expert reviewers to assess the scientific quality of the paper. The Editors are responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles. The Editors' decision is final.

### Completing the Score Sheet

We ask peer reviewers to read articles for accuracy, historical context, depth of research, organization, and quality of writing.

The score sheet below includes a recommendation field, comments to the editor, comments to the author. You can attach the reviewed file with your comments.

To complete the score sheet, respond to all fields. When filling out the score sheet, please remember the following things:

- Comments to Editor: Use this space to transfer to the Editor the basis for your recommendation for acceptance or rejection. These comments will NOT be conveyed to the author.
- Comments to Author: Use this space to convey specific feedback to the author on your recommendation. Please do NOT reference the Comments to Editor field as the author will not have direct access to those comments.

### Submitting Your Review:

[jehrhe.journal\(at\)gmail.com](mailto:jehrhe.journal(at)gmail.com)

By

Referee's name :  
Date sent: --/--/--  
Due back to editor:

**Journal of Energy History / Revue d'histoire de l'énergie  
Manuscript Reader Report**

Title:

**Recommendation:**

- Unconditional Acceptance – ready for copyediting
- Conditional acceptance with minor content revisions
- Major revision – these resubmissions will be reviewed again
- Rejection

Evaluation: For any criterion rated “weak,” please offer specific recommendations for improvement in the additional space provided below.

	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak
<b>Content</b>			
Topic is within the scope of JEH?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opens up a new content area in its field?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Author acknowledges literature and other interpretations of topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusion is supported by research presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Research</b>	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak
Article reflects original research?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research is informed by appropriate fields?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Article is adequately documented, drawing on appropriate sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Organization and Writing</b>	Strong	Satisfactory	Weak
Thesis is clear?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Article is well organized?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing is clear and engaging?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR**

1. What absolutely must be done to make this a high quality paper ? Please be as specific as possible and include here whether you consider this paper to make a significant contribution to the body of scholarly work in this area and why.
2. What additional recommendations would you make to the author, beyond those previously suggested? Please be as specific as possible.

**COMMENTS TO THE EDITORS**

What comments do you have for the editors' eyes only.