

FORUM+ is an international peer-reviewed journal for research in and through the arts. We explore the latest trends in research in the arts, which is steadily gaining importance in higher arts education and universities in Flanders and the Netherlands. FORUM+ stimulates the dialogue between research in the arts, critical reflection, and the social context in which they are established.

FORUM+ publishes various contributions in Dutch and English that stem from original research in the arts. Aside from the traditional scientific articles, the editorial staff explicitly welcomes alternative formats, such as artistic contributions, visual and reflective essays, podcasts, audiovisual contributions, and interviews. FORUM+ also publishes reviews or review/essay hybrids. In this way, FORUM+ aims to provide a platform for the multiplicity of manifestations that shape research in the arts.

All contributions are peer-reviewed and evaluated by an editorial and advisory board member, as well as external experts. They undertake this review on a voluntary basis. As an academic journal, FORUM+ does not remunerate authors or reviewers. Publishing and contributing are part of the academic activities and/or social services of higher education institutions and research institutes. FORUM+ acknowledges the efforts of reviewers by listing them in the colophon and by encouraging authors to mention the peer reviewers in their acknowledgements. Upon request, FORUM+ will send a free print copy to authors and reviewers.

On the use of generative AI, FORUM+ aligns its position with the European Research Area (ERA) Platform's *Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research*. As a research organization, FORUM+ is committed to promoting awareness and cultivating a responsible use of generative AI, with consideration for its environmental impact and societal effects. For more information, you can visit [the ERA website](#). We endorse the four key principles of reliability, honesty, respect, and accountability, and we encourage authors to transparently disclose any substantial use of generative AI in the preparation of their submissions. Reviewers should also refrain from using generative AI tools in sensitive activities such as peer reviews or evaluations and use generative AI respecting privacy, confidentiality, and intellectual property rights.

## EXPECTATIONS AND TIPS

The editorial board stimulates an open dialogue between authors and reviewers and is convinced that a constructive exchange of ideas benefits the quality of the publication. That is why we consciously choose for an **open peer review system** (not blind or anonymous). Reviewers are encouraged to share their feedback with co-reviewers in order to build on each other's feedback and encourage ongoing interaction. If you have suggestions for adjustments, these will be sent as feedback to the author (not anonymously). If you have diverging views on this way of sharing and communicating, the editorial office is open to amend the process accordingly. Feedback can be given in the form of a report addressed to the author, a letter, or a conversation. Any comments that are addressed solely to the editorial board of FORUM+ and not to the author must be mentioned separately and explicitly as such.

You can keep these guidelines on formulating feedback in mind:

- Motivate your suggestions concisely.
- Focus on the potential of the contribution.
- Formulate your suggestions constructively. Don't focus on what is bad, but suggest how something can be done better.
- Be aware of the tone in your feedback: it should be the same as if you were giving the feedback verbally or in person.
- Formulate detailed suggestions, preferably using the 'track changes' function in the Word document.

To identify specific linguistic, grammatical and stylistic problems, you can also use the 'track changes' function in the Word document.

# GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEWER

The reviewer can evaluate the submitted contribution based on the following – non-exhaustive – criteria:

- ◇ **Scope**  
Does the contribution explicitly focus on research in and through the arts; in other words, does it relate to the field of artistic research? Is the author also the artist/artistic researcher who conducted the research themselves, or is it more of a contemplative contribution that looks extrinsically at research in the arts? Does the contribution reflect on methodological issues within the field of artistic research, or does it sufficiently address the methodology of research in and through the arts?
- ◇ **Originality**  
Is the contribution original enough? Does it provide renewed artistic and/or conceptual insights? Does the contribution hold potential? How can the contribution be adjusted in order to increase the potential?
- ◇ **Relevance**  
Is the subject of the contribution topical? Does the contribution imply a certain urgency? Is the research embedded in a broader context and does it have an impact on the existing debate? Is the contribution scientifically and/or artistically relevant? Can the contribution raise new questions and lines of thought?
- ◇ **Quality**  
Is the set-up of the contribution sufficiently clear? Does the author/maker clearly present the applied method or (artistic) process? Does the contribution include a reflection on one's own process (choices made, procedure, experience,...)? Are the references relevant? Is the argumentation clearly formulated and well-founded? Does the author/maker formulate a transparent conclusion?
- ◇ **Presentation**  
Is the contribution well-structured? Is the content convincing and accessible? Is the author's/maker's style sufficiently qualitative? Does the chosen form of the contribution match the content? Does the author/maker apply a clear and correct language use?
- ◇ **Inclusivity**  
Is the language used inclusive? For more information and tips, you can visit the [ALDA Europe website](#), for example. We ask our authors to critically question their bibliography and include a diversity of sources and perspectives: Who is (not) represented? What does the source (not) tell us? Is there a balance between the different voices presented?

On the basis of this evaluation, the reviewer gives the following advice to the editorial board:

- ☐ Accepted: if the contribution in its current state is suitable for publication in FORUM+.
- ☐ Accepted, provided that adjustments will be made: if the contribution holds potential but needs revision.
- ☐ Not suitable for publication in FORUM+: if the contribution doesn't comply with the criteria set out above.

You may direct your evaluation and advice to [redactie@forum-online.be](mailto:redactie@forum-online.be). Later versions of a contribution are always presented to the reviewers in order to follow up whether their feedback has been sufficiently processed.

## CHECKLIST AFTER CONTRIBUTION ACCEPTANCE

### Are all text components present?

- ☐ Title
- ☐ Subtitle (N/A with reviews)
- ☐ Abstract (N/A with reviews)
- ☐ Keywords (N/A with reviews)
- ☐ Leads
- ☐ Biography (optionally with pronouns)
- ☐ Optional components: Email address and acknowledgements

### Images

- ☐ Are of sufficient quality, both artistically and technically
- ☐ Have copyright and captions

### Endnotes

- ☐ Are in accordance with [MLA guidelines](#)
- ☐ Are used consistently (there are **no in-text citations, except for page numbers in reviews**)