

Evaluation guidelines (translated from the original in Japanese)

The contributions will be reviewed in accordance with the "double blind peer review" system.

The process consists of three stages:

1. CFP office (contributions will be anonymised and forwarded to 2.)
2. Commission for the allocation of anonymous contributions to the evaluators
3. Two reviewers for each contribution

Evaluation aspects:

(1) academic content: a. autonomy and originality of the viewpoint, the research process and the result. b. contributions to the extension, deepening and renewal of Schopenhauer research, c. to what extent, if at all, the arguments are supported by solid textual work (both from the complete works and from the manuscript remains) and are conducted according to the modern international state of research, including the secondary literature from the German-speaking countries as well as from the author's own country

(2) Academic structure and style: a. whether the standard academic conventions have been followed: appropriate structuring, appropriate citations and references, footnotes or endnotes, adherence to copyright b. the paper should be written clearly and concisely, using the appropriate academic terms to the level of the topic, c. linguistic expression: intelligibility, congruency and style.

Evaluation process:

Each contribution will receive a score for each of points in the two categories above, then the overall scores from these two scores will be added together to give an overall final score (no mathematical averages of the individual points) .

The evaluator may add further evaluation points to a., b. and c. which may influence the overall scores of (1) or (2) and thus also the final score.

The grading scale of the final result:

S (excellent), description: an undoubtedly outstanding contribution to the Schopenhauer research of highest originality and scientificity in both content and form.

A (very good), description: a very good contribution to the Schopenhauer research with high originality and scientificity in both content and form.

B (good / satisfactory), description: a clear contribution to the Schopenhauer research concerning the points "(1) a. and c." or "(1) b. and c." with the appropriate formal quality (2).

C (sufficient), description: a well-written essay that satisfies the conditions of (2), but presents minimal / no significant scientific originality or little (minimal) / no scientifically extending or deepening contribution to modern Schopenhauer research (1).

D (unsatisfactory), description: a contribution, which does not match the above mentioned requirements.

The indication of the scores is obligatory, the description of the scoring or of its reasons optional.

In the assessment of acceptance / non-acceptance of the contribution, category (1) is primarily taken into consideration, while category (2) plays a complementary role. However, if category (2) was graded as D, then the final grade, regardless of the overall grade received in category (1), is also D.