



REGULAR SUBMISSION Review Form

The editors are concerned to prevent any conflict of interest between reviewers and authors. If you believe that there may be a conflict of interest, please discuss the problem with the action editor before filling in this form.

Title of paper
When was dissonance a dissonance?

Date of review	Name of reviewer (optional)	Email address (optional)
April 5 th , 2013		

This review form will be forwarded to authors. To remain anonymous, leave the name and email fields blank.

Please list one or more (sub-) disciplines of music (-ology) in which you have expertise* that you consider relevant for the evaluation of this manuscript.	Supradiscipline (humanities or sciences)	Level of your expertise		
		low	medium	high
Psychoacoustics	Science			x
Music cognition	Science			x
Music theory	humanities		x	

Quantitative evaluation of manuscript:

	inadequate	acceptable	good	excellent
1. Musical relevance			x	
2. Interdisciplinarity		x		
3. Academic quality			x	
4. Presentation			x	
5. Title			x	
6. Abstract			x	
7. General		x		

Explanatory notes:

1. Musical relevance: The word “music” includes all cultures, styles, genres, functions and contexts.
2. Interdisciplinarity: Please consider the two main disciplines and their interaction, including:
 - a. the distance between them (difference in epistemology, methods etc.)
 - b. their balance in this manuscript (the relative size of their contribution)
 - c. their synergy in this manuscript (emergence of original insights from the interdisciplinary combination rather than the individual disciplines)
3. Academic quality: Please consider originality, theoretical and practical significance, and methodological rigor, referring to the usual standards within your specific discipline or subdiscipline.
4. Presentation: Please consider grammar, readability, concision, structure, use of figures and tables, and accessibility for an interdisciplinary audience.
5. The title should accurately reflect the content and include the main keywords.
6. The abstract should be structured according to the information for authors. Every point in the abstract should be expanded upon in the paper.

Your recommendation:

Accept	Publish as is	
	Minor revisions: The manuscript should be acceptable for publication if your suggestions are implemented. In this case, you will not see the paper again; the editors will ensure that your recommendations are taken seriously and followed up appropriately.	x
	Major revisions: The manuscript might be acceptable for publication, but only after extensive revision. You may for example recommend major additions or deletions, or a major change in the organisation. If the two reviewers independently agree on this option, we will ask the authors to resubmit their paper, and the entire review procedure will be repeated.	
Reject: The manuscript is unlikely to be publishable after revision - regardless of the nature or extent of the revisions.		

* The discipline/s in which you are qualified by virtue either of a university degree or publications in leading international journals.



Qualitative evaluation. JIMS regards qualitative evaluation as central to academic quality control and asks reviewers to pay special attention to this task. We would be grateful for *1-2 pages of comments*. What is good and what is not good about the submission? What specific improvements should be made before publication? Please distinguish between necessary and desirable revisions. Your primary task is to evaluate the manuscript against the usual standards in your discipline(s) as set out above, but we also welcome your appraisal from the point of view of other relevant disciplines. In any case, the primary aim of your comments should be to *help the authors*. Please therefore write in a friendly, helpful style, carefully avoiding personal, emotional, sarcastic or otherwise potentially offensive language. Finally, please check that your qualitative and quantitative evaluations are consistent with each other.

This paper presents a historical overview of consonance and dissonance in European music from the end of the Middle Ages on. The available documents are used to discuss the evolution of music writing through a period of several centuries. The limitations implied by the sparsity of such documents and the fact that only written traces exist are also discussed.

This overview is mostly clear and well-written. I would however have liked to see the implications of these facts summarized more thoroughly with respect to the questions presented at the end of the abstract in the final discussion (especially for non-specialist readers for whom the content is quite dense).

Finally, since many questions pertain to perceptual aspects of dissonance, I think the paper could benefit from a brief mention of aspects of modern research in music cognition that relate to these questions.

Minor points :

- p.1 abstract : if notions of what dissonance IS kept changing... ?
- p.1 intro : More uncertainties MAY exist concerning... ?
- p.2 l.11 : a come is missing between "century" and "the"
- p.5, end of first paragraph : I feel the word "deduce" is too strong. I think that the phenomenon rather suggests that cultural expectation forcefully frames our interpretation of what we hear.
- p6, second paragraph. I think the use of the word "impressive" in that sentence makes it incorrect.
- p7, when referencing to the Shepard tone. One can not really say that the shepard tone is itself an auditory illusion. It is a specific type of tone (containing energy only at octaves of the fundamental frequency) that can be used in sequence to create the illusion of ever ascending or descending scales.
- p8, third paragraph : there is one 'that' too many in the first sentence of the paragraph. Also there is a typo in "horizontal"
- p11, first paragraph : I'm not sure I understand from the text on what rests the point of Bent that is put forward here by the authors.
- p12 l.3 : the text reads "the essence of dissonance be said to be have been perceptual".
- P.12 en of the first paragraph : erase either "specific" of "the" in "than specific the chromatic semitone per se"