

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		Research question		Argumentation		Theoretical location		Perspectives	
1	The post-institutional era. Visions of history in research on intellectual disability	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The central question/problem stays implicit. The following questions are formulated for Disability Studies: What is the failure of deinstitutionalisation; how are we to understand an era that both promises citizenship and repeatedly breaks these promises; and how does power operate in this era?</p>	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>No conclusion (see argumentation line).</p> <p>Answers and solutions to raised questions/problems stay implicit.</p> <p>Inspired by postcolonial theory, intellectual disability politics can be framed as post-institutional rather than deinstitutionalised because Forms of repressive power changed despite progressive narrative.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The common thread is easy to follow due to connecting passages.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The article</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. reconstructs a perceived historical break between the eras of institutionalisation and citizenship inclusion, 2. carves out analytical tools offered in postcolonial theory, 3. characterises the post-institutional era and how repressive powers operates within it, 4. discusses possibilities of critique and resistance to the post-institutional era by involving people with intellectual disability in research and policy-making. 	<p>Comprehensively.</p> <p>Gayatri Spivak's subalternity & unlearning privileges and Edward Said's Orientalism seem well suited to characterise how people with intellectual disabilities are governed in supposedly deinstitutionalised states like Sweden to date.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>No critique on Spivak nor Said is taken into account.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The author terms "post-institutionalisation" to characterise the present era of intellectual disability politics.</p>	<p>Rather yes.</p> <p>Further research questions are implicitly raised, connected to the need to develop a less exclusionary vocabulary for inclusive theory building.</p>
2	Rappers' (special) education revelations. A Black feminist decolonial analysis.	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The central question/problem stays implicit. The following questions are formulated before the conceptual framing of</p>	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The authors identify six lyrical themes in rap music on special education and schooling.</p>	<p>Rather yes.</p> <p>The authors provide connecting passages, yet the common thread is not</p>	<p>Rather yes.</p> <p>The authors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. situate themselves as Black education scholars regarding Hip Hop and special education, 	<p>Rather not comprehensively.</p> <p>The authors claim to employ a Black feminist decolonial lens but seem to rather focus on</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Decolonial positions are not specified.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The authors frame Hip Hop as an alternative curriculum to teach Black stories and address epistemic injustices at the</p>	<p>Rather yes.</p> <p>The authors suggest bringing the analysed lyrics into a conversation with lyrics from Krip Hop and other</p>

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		the analysis: What do Black rappers who attend(ed) public schools in the United States reveal about specialised educational services? What do these rappers reveal about teachers and public schooling?		always easy to follow.	2. conceptually frame their analysis in Black feminist and decolonial thought, 3. describe their methods informed by ethnomusicology, 4. identify six lyrical themes on the intersection of anti-Black racism and ableism in their data, 5. conclude by making recommendations to curriculum studies and workers.	intersectionality and Critical Race theory.		intersection of ableism and anti-Black racism.	minority forms of Hip Hop.
3	Disabled movement beyond metaphor in Michael Ondaatje's <i>The Cat's Table</i> and Abdulrazak Gurnah's <i>By the Sea</i>	Rather no. The central question/problem stays implicit. The author states to offer a brief analysis of disability in relation to the Indian Ocean littoral and of the disciplinary gap between disability studies and Indian Ocean studies.	Rather no. In their conclusion, the author states to have explored disabled characters and their dis/allowed movement in Indian Ocean literature.	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.	Rather no. The headings do not offer a clear orientation regarding the argumentation.	Rather comprehensively. The author mainly draws on Ato Quayson (2007), which is certainly fitting for a literary analysis of disability from a postcolonial perspective. However, Quayson's concept is not combined with more contemporary notions.	No. No critique on Quayson is taken into account	Rather yes. In Indian Ocean Literature, disability is deployed as more than a metaphor for postcolonial experiences but as a site of colonial subjugation, containment and resistance.	Rather no. The author argues to further the interdisciplinary engagement between disability studies and Indian Ocean literature to deepen representations of disability and inform debates on the lived experiences of dis/abled migrants yet does not formulate further research questions.
4	Knowing Through Tripping. A Performative Praxis	Rather yes.	Rather yes.	Rather yes.	Yes.	Rather not comprehensively.	No.	Yes.	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
	for Co-Constructing Knowledge as a Disabled Halfie	How can critical disability studies better address research practices in diverse postcolonial contexts?	Critical Disability Studies should attend to intersectional privileges and performativity. In postcolonial contexts, researchers with disabilities may not become insiders to the disability community based on their disability status alone.	The author provides connecting passages, yet they do not always take up the headings of the subsequent passages.	The article is organised along three interrelated methodological stages proposed by the underlying methodology (performance ethnography): mimesis, poiesis, and kinesis.	The article references Gayatri Spivak, yet not any specific concept. Spivak's work is certainly fitting to question intersectional privileges.	No critique on Spivak is taken into account.	The author points out intersectional privileges in participatory research with disabled people in the Global South. She concludes that shared identities with researched subjects (e.g. disabled Indians) are insufficient to decolonise disability knowledge(s).	
5	Southern Bodies and Disability. Re-thinking concepts	Rather no. The central question/problem stays implicit. The author states to explore the social embodiment (of disability?) on a global scale. Further, the paper's intention is framed (in the conclusion) as re-making disability studies from the global South, which requires a major reconsideration of concepts, according to the author.	Rather no. The author concludes that the history of social embodiment in the colonised world is different.	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.	Rather yes. The author introduces embodiment as social (1) and Southern perspectives on society (2) before turning to different ways disability is socially produced in postcolonial contexts: 3. Conquest and its consequences: the global politics of impairment 4. Global capitalism and its consequences 5. Modern global patriarchy and its consequences	Comprehensively. Syed Farid Alatas' academic dependency and Paulin Hountondji's extraversion seem well suited to describe Eurocentric knowledge production in Disability Studies.	No. No critique on Alatas or Hountondji is taken into account.	Yes. The author argues for understanding disability as socially embodied and influenced by key processes that formed world society (colonialism, globalised capitalism, patriarchy).	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
					The conclusion addresses embodied encounters on a world scale.				
6	Occupied Land is an Access Issue. Interventions in Feminist Disability Studies and Narratives of Indigenous Activism	Rather yes. No central question is formulated, yet the author states the central problem to be a critique of foundational Disability Studies concepts of access based on settler state-granted accommodations without critically examining disabling legacies of colonisation. In the middle of the introduction, the following question is raised: What would it look like for feminist Disability Studies scholars to formulate a scholarly praxis acknowledging how land theft generates uneven points of access to health and wellness?	No. As the central question/problem remains unclear, there is also no comprehensive answer. Similar questions are raised in the conclusion.	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.	Rather yes. The author 1. critiques foundational Disability Studies concepts of access as based on disabling settler state structures, 2. analyses ableism in the anti-obesity discourse targeting indigenous youth, 3. introduces indigenous narratives of health and environmental activism as counter-narratives to settler state structures, 4. concludes that health is political and living on occupied land has disabling effects.	Rather comprehensively. Winona LaDuke's <i>All our relations</i> seems fitting to analyse the connections between environmental and bodily health and health as a political concept.	No. No critique on LaDuke is taken into account.	Yes. The author argues that settler occupied Indigenous land is a feminist disability concern.	Rather yes. How can notions of access be reformulated without relying on settler state-granted accommodations? What would it look like to imagine possibilities for neurodivergent and/or chronically ill and disabled crips to exist interdependently outside failed settler state structures on occupied Indigenous lands?
7	Decolonial Theory and Disability Studies. On the Modernity/Coloniality of Ability	Rather no. The central question/problem stays implicit.	No. In their conclusion, implications of decolonial theory for Disability Studies and	Yes. The authors provide connective phrases and	Rather yes. The authors 1. introduce hegemonic approaches to	Rather not comprehensively. References to many decolonial scholars, yet the central	No.	Rather no. The authors equate disablement with coloniality of being, a metaphorical use	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		The authors frame the paper's purpose as decolonising psychological science by rethinking hegemonic understandings of psychological functioning. To this end, they apply two decolonial strategies of a cultural psychology analysis, namely normalising (disability) and denaturalising (hegemonic accounts of ability). They use DS perspectives as a transgressive standpoint to enable a decolonial analysis of conventional knowledge systems in hegemonic psychological science.	vice versa are discussed.	several summaries, making the common thread easy to follow.	disability in psychology, 2. introduce the social model of disability as mainstream Disability Studies notion that normalises disability, 3. introduce Critical Race Theory and Global Disability Studies to denaturalise hegemonic accounts of disability, 4. conclude by discussing the implications of decolonial theory for Disability Studies and vice versa.	notions of modernity/coloniality are not attributed to Anibal Quijano & Walter Mignolo.		of disability and colonialism that has been criticised in Disability Studies and Postcolonial Studies. The presented perspectives might be new to psychology, yet they probably are not to Disability Studies or Decolonial Studies.	
8	Troubling constructions of Canada as a "land of opportunity" for immigrants. A critical disability lens	Yes. The author examines discourses of Canada as a land of opportunities for immigrants to answer the central question: "opportunities for whom and at what cost?"	Rather yes. The author concludes that opportunities for immigrants are unequally distributed due to gatekeeping discourses that are ableist (excessive demand, health risk) and racist (northern superiority, worthiness). Immigrants	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting. However, the purpose of the paper is repeatedly restated (reconstructing how discourses	Rather yes. The author 1. contextualises immigration to Canada 2. introduces CDA as methodology, 3. presents key findings in the form of central discourses shaping the experience of	Not comprehensively. Post- and decolonial authors are only mentioned in one reference without recurring to specific concepts.	No.	Yes.	Rather no. The author poses (and answers) one additional question in her conclusion: how the reported research is linked to the so-called "refugee crisis". She further explicates the following claim and states that it

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
			internalise these discourses and incur costs when e.g. covering their disabilities or presenting themselves as worthy.	of ableism, racism and colonialism operate within constructions of Canada as a welcoming country).	disabled immigrants in Canada, 4. discusses the findings and concludes that opportunities for disabled immigrants are unequally distributed due to gatekeeping ableist and racist discourses.			cannot be examined within the scope of this paper, namely that the Global South is holding the North accountable for its colonial construction as superior by forcing Northern societies to uphold their claims to be spaces of opportunity.	
9	Theoretical dimensions for interrogating the intersection of disability, immigration and social work	Yes. How are the intersections of disability and immigration configured in diverse ways - neither locally specific nor universal?	Rather no. The intersections of disability and immigration, e.g. experiences of marginalisation, are shaped by the coloniality of power relations and knowledge production.	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting, and the paper has only two subheadings.	Yes. The author presents areas of overlap between discourses (?) colonialism, disability and social justice, namely 1. knowledge production and dominance in North/South power Relations and 2. construction and processes of Othering before presenting 3. concluding thoughts.	Rather comprehensively. Anibal Quijano's coloniality of power seems fitting to critique power relations in global knowledge production and Edward Said's orientalism to analyse Othering at the intersection of migration and disability.	No.	Yes. This article proposes three "theoretical dimensions" to help bridge between Global North and South theorisations to shape alternative ways of addressing the marginalisation experiences of people with disabilities in both hemispheres.	No.
10	Tracing and troubling continuities between ableism and colonialism in Canada	Rather yes. What are the intersections	Rather yes. Ongoing settler-colonial nation-building undermines the sovereignty of	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting	Rather yes. The authors 1. highlight commonalities between debates	Rather comprehensively. The authors draw on many different indigenous and	No.	Yes. The authors propose to understand ableist	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		and continuities between ableism and colonialism in Canada? In which way has ableist violence historically functioned as a colonial tool? What does decolonising CDS mean?	indigenous populations and is related to disability/mad containment and degradation. Decolonising CDS might translate to a sustained analysis of colonial realities in settler-colonial states, a recognition of the absence of indigenous peoples apart from as subjects of study, and a changed portrayal of indigenous peoples, centring their specific disability experiences.	passages /signposting.	over language on indigeneity and disability, 2. trace histories and present realities of colonisation in Canada, 3. introduce existing theoretical tools in CDS and their constraints to theorise white settler supremacy, 4. call out ableist violence as a colonial tool and 5. chart possibilities of what decolonising in CDS might mean.	postcolonial authors yet do not incorporate specific concepts.		violence as a colonial tool.	
11	Decolonising disability. Thinking and acting globally	Yes (central problem). Intellectual crisis for Disability Studies as Global South experiences are marginalised due to the scholarly colonialism.	Yes. The paper addresses the raised problem conclusively in outlining global atrocities by which the Global North produces disability in the Global South.	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting. One chapter ("The northernness of disability theory") seems to be structured according to Raewyn Connell's Southern	Rather no. The overall outline is not easy to grasp, although the division of individual chapters into subchapters is intuitively understandable.	Rather not comprehensively. One chapter draws on Raewyn Connell's Southern Theory, whereas the rest of the paper does not build on postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous concepts.	No.	Yes. A southern theory of disability acknowledges disabling impacts of colonialism in the Global South and the need to prevent impairment and disability, which complicate pride agendas.	Rather no. The author points out implications for further research, though: Disability should be understood as geopolitically specific rather than universal. Disability research should employ an empathetic reading of indigenous understandings of

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
				Theory. However, whether the subheadings are named after Connel's concepts is not explicitly stated.					impairment and disability. Disability Studies should establish allyship with movements that strive for impairment prevention like peace activism.
12	Access into professional degrees by students with disabilities in South African higher learning	Rather yes. Which (invisible) barriers do disabled students face when entering higher learning institutions in South Africa? What are their underlying causes?	Yes. While inclusion policies still enabled access of all students to professional degrees, there were inequitable practices, alienation and inequality that excluded students with disabilities at entry. Obstacles seen at the surface level were not the real ones; the real ones were the deep-seated issues of coloniality.	Rather yes. The author does not provide connecting passages. However, there is some signposting as to what the article focuses on.	Yes. The author 1. outlines what is required to enter professional degrees in the South African higher learning context, 2. elaborates on decolonial theory 3. presents the study's methodology, and 4. findings in terms of obstacles perceived by study participants to enter specific professional degrees, before 5. discussing the results against the background of decolonial theory and 6. drawing a conclusion.	Comprehensively. The paper references several decolonial scholars and their concepts and extensively draws on the introduced concepts to discuss the results.	No.	Yes. In South Africa, barriers to inclusion in higher learning are invisible even to disabled students, as they are rooted in coloniality. Dismantling barriers requires awareness of their underlying coloniality.	Rather no. However, the author points out the relevance of resistance and the importance of intersectionality, which raises further research questions.
13	Unsettling research versus activism. How	Yes.	Rather no.	Rather no.	Rather yes.	Not comprehensively.	No.	Rather no.	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
	might critical disability studies disrupt traditional research boundaries?	How can critical Disability Studies be more reflexive about knowledge which privileges particular ways of knowing from the Global North? What alternative possibilities exist to foster more inclusive and transformative knowledge that tackles systemic forms of oppression in colonial and postcolonial contexts?	The authors argue that localised critical theory, non-academic inclusive practices, and participatory methods create a space for collective learning. Still, the answer remains rather vague. In the discussion, the authors list their challenges in decolonising their research yet do not answer their central question. They mainly list stakeholders that need to be engaged and conclude that activist researchers need to make the voices of disabled women and girls in the Global South heard – without specifying how.	The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.	The authors 1. introduce participatory research as a politics of engagement, 2. share experiences of how they engaged different stakeholders in their empirical research project, namely 2.1 girls with disabilities, 2.2 women with disabilities, 2.3 DPOs, 2.4 communities, 2.5 researchers and activists in Global North and South, before 3. discussing and 4. drawing conclusions	Postcolonial authors are only mentioned in one paragraph in the section on how to engage researchers and activists in Global North and South.		The authors conclude that intersectional privileges in north-south research collaborations must be reflected.	The second question raised in the introduction is restated: We ask, then, what alternative possibilities exist to foster more inclusive and transformative knowledge in colonial and postcolonial contexts?
14	Walking the Talk. Towards a More Inclusive Field of Disability Studies	Rather yes. How can Disability Studies be conceptualised, learned, taught, researched, and promoted/expanded in a truly inclusive	Rather yes. The author argues that Eurocentrism in Disability Studies should be acknowledged and problematised. Scholarship from	Rather no. The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.	Rather yes The author 1. shares her motivation for the underlying analysis, 2. frames her analysis as anti-colonial,	Rather comprehensively. The author intensively engages with Helen Meekosha's call to decolonise Disability Studies. George J. Sefa Dei's anti-	No.	Rather no. The author criticises that Disability Studies are Eurocentric. However, the paper provides empirical proof for this claim	Rather no. The author raises a few questions in her conclusion. Yet, they would rather support the overall argument: If the majority of people

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		<p>manner that seeks to address issues of equity and social justice? However, this question is only comprehensively stated in her conclusion.</p> <p>Further: How often do Disability Studies courses address such colonialism, Human Rights violations, and forces that continue to cause disablement in the Global South?</p>	<p>othered groups should be represented and included in Disability Studies academic discourses.</p>		<p>3. describes her methodology (document analysis),</p> <p>4. presents existing knowledge on the underrepresentation of</p> <p>4.1 racialised bodies,</p> <p>4.2 the Global South,</p> <p>4.3 indigenous communities,</p> <p>5. presents her findings</p>	<p>colonial framework and Walter Mignolo's Occidentalism seem fitting to this end.</p>		<p>based on Disability Studies curricula. The presentation of findings is only about one page long due to the unavailability of detailed (public) information on Disability Studies curricula in Canada.</p>	<p>with disabilities in the world today are in the Global South and from racialised and Indigenous communities, why are they absent in Disability Studies in the academy? Can students from these spaces identify with our institutions' teaching and research faculty? What do students from the dominant group know about disabled people from other spaces? How do they know about what they know?</p>
15	<p>A call to rethink the Global North university. Mobilising disabled students' experiences through the encounter of Critical Disability Studies and Epistemologies of the South</p>	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The author claims to follow the calls to decolonise Disability Studies and attend to the intersection of disability and race. Further, the author announces to suggest potential ways to reinvent the Global North university as a space for epistemological</p>	<p>No. The given answers do not connect to a question previously raised.</p> <p>The conclusion centres three strategies employed by disabled students to rethink Global North universities: Embracing "intercultural translation" for ontological diversity,</p>	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The author does not provide connecting passages /signposting.</p>	<p>Rather no.</p> <p>The author</p> <p>1. presents recent development in (neoliberal) universities and</p> <p>2. Disability Studies ("Old battles, new ontologies, epistemological absences"),</p> <p>3. presents her research study and</p> <p>4. findings before</p>	<p>Comprehensively.</p> <p>The author thoroughly receives many different post- and decolonial scholars and specifically applies Boaventura de Silva Santos' Epistemologies of the South to decolonise the Global North university.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The author attempts to learn from Post- and Decolonial Theory and strategies employed by disabled students to reinvent Global North universities, e.g. Crip time.</p>	<p>No.</p>

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		diversity and subjective freedom.	Making the university present in its locality and globality, and Giving epistemological validity to community practices.		5. drawing conclusions. The overall argumentation regarding her findings is not easy to follow.				
16	[Encuentros entre la perspectiva decolonial y los estudios de la discapacidad] Encounters between the decolonial perspective and Disabilities Studies	Rather yes (central problem) The article intends to inquire how disability and a decolonial perspective can be articulated from the viewpoint of Critical Disability Studies, reflecting the impact of the power matrix of neoliberal modernity.	Rather yes. The authors conclusively address how decolonial theory and Disability Studies should recognise ableist and colonialist epistemologies as inherent parts of modernity.	Rather yes. The authors provide connecting passages and transitions that are also understandable for non-native speakers.	Rather yes. The authors: 1 introduce disability studies, 2 Critical disability studies and 3 decolonial theory, 4. critique modernity as colonial and ableist shaped by 4.1 Eurocentricism, 4.2 colonisation of knowledge and 4.3 colonisation of being, 5. draw conclusions for a detachment from neoliberal-able and colonial modernity.	Comprehensively. The authors thoroughly review decolonial theory. Anibal Quijano's coloniality of power and Nelson Madonaldo Torres' colonisation of being seem fitting to critique modernity as colonial and ableist.	No.	Yes. The paper explicitly shows the similarities between decolonial (not postcolonial) theory and Disability Studies in their opposition to ableist and colonialist modernity.	Rather no. The authors do not raise further research questions yet call for more research on practices and epistemologies concealed by the matrix of ableist and colonialist power of modernity. They further propose intersectional alliances to make disabling structures in contemporary society visible.
17	Troubling Law's Indefinite Detention. Disability, the Carceral Body and Institutional Injustice	Rather yes (well-defined problem). The article problematises indefinite detention as institutional injustice. To this end, the author questions assumptions about time and space	Rather yes. The author conclusively addresses issues of indefinite detention based on a case study of one disabled Indigenous Australian woman.	Rather yes. The author provides connecting passages for most transitions and also several references to earlier sections.	Rather yes. The author 1. introduces the theoretical and 2. methodological approach before 3. presenting the case study in a thematically	Not comprehensively. The author references Jasbir Puar yet does not follow her terminology of "debilitation". Further, necropolitics is mentioned without reference to	No.	Yes. The paper demonstrates the intersectionality and coloniality of the continuum of carceral control. It further points out the limitations of	Rather no. The author does not raise further research questions yet calls for a more complex understanding of the relationships between disability,

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		and related dichotomies of indefinite/definite and detention/liberty that mediate the legal concept of indefinite detention and order our understanding of the injustices of indefinite detention.			structured discussion covering - the range of options for detention, - the temporality of detention, - the spatiality of detention 4. discusses legal implications. The overall argument is comprehensible and valid, yet the headings do not provide easy orientation.	postcolonial scholar Achille Mbembe.		how indefinite detention is legally defined against the background that disabled offenders can be detained by the criminal justice and the disability “support” system.	law, institutions and violence.
18	Canadian Disability Policies in a World of Inequalities	Rather yes. What norms or practices shape how we think and act in relation to disabilities? What are the key ideas related to disabilities and how have they changed over time? What are the material circumstances of diverse people with and without disabilities and how have they changed over time?	Rather yes. The author identifies two normative orientations, (1) historical and present Indigenous-settler relations (as the development and improvement of Jordan’s principle) and (2) Human Rights. Colonialism and Neoliberalism are identified as the origin of a wide range of problems concerning disability,	Rather yes. The author does not provide connecting passages, yet the paper structure is easy to grasp. The author repeatedly explains what she does in the paper on a meta-level.	Rather yes. The author 1. introduces her critical theory framework on Canadian Disability Policies, 2. provides background on Canadian Disability Policies, 3. elaborates answers to the raised questions, 4. draws conclusions about the way forward.	Not comprehensively. The author does not reference any original post-/decolonial or indigenous scholar, only Jordan’s Principle, an indigenous approach based on Indigenous values of childhood and inclusion. This principle has been continuously improved in its implementation.	No.	Rather no. In her conclusion, the author points out intersectional inequalities and calls for mutual learning of indigenous people and settlers that requires humility.	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
			e.g. the idea that being dead is better than being disabled.						
19	Breaking Down. A critical discourse analysis of John Langdon Down's (1866) classification of people with trisomy 21 (Down syndrome).	Yes. How are people with "Mongolian idiocy" constructed as the "other" in John Langdon Down's (1866) seminal text, <i>Observations of an Ethnic Classification of Idiots</i> ?	Yes. Down constructs people with Trisomy 21 as racially "degenerated" based on Blumenbach's racial hierarchy. He essentialises the visual, behavioural and intellectual "otherness" of people with Trisomy 21.	Rather yes. The author provides signposting – at the beginning of each unit of analysis, he announces what this section will focus. Connecting passages are not provided	Yes. The author 1. introduces his theoretical (Postcolonial Theory) and methodological (Discourse-historical approach) background, 2. presents his analysis in terms of historical, situational, interdiscursive and textual context, 4. discusses the findings and concludes that traces of Down's (1866) problematic notions can be found in contemporary medical and scientific discourses.	Rather comprehensively. Edward Said's Orientalism and Said's/ Gayatri Spivak's Othering seem fitting for analysing the construction of Trisomy 21.	Yes. The author considers that postcolonial conceptions of "othering" have been criticised as dichotomous and as overlooking agency of the othered. Hence, he adds Homi Bhabha's hybridity and mimicry.	Yes. The author shows how ableist and racist discourses are intertwined in the historical construction of Trisomy 21.	No.
20	The Politics of "People with Lived Experience" Experiential Authority and the Risks of Strategic Essentialism	Rather yes. The following question is raised in the introduction. It is not framed as a central question yet seems to guide the argumentation: Which implications arise when those of us with	Yes. The author comprehensively addresses how co-production can either disrupt or solidify hegemonic ways of doing Mental Health research. "People with lived	Yes. The author provides connecting passages/ signposting and much meta-information on what she is	Rather yes. The author 1. introduces the crisis in representation whereby scholars of "difference" critiqued Western epistemology,	Rather comprehensively. Gayatri Spivak's strategic essentialism and Edward Said's Orientalism seem fitting to discuss a denaturalisation of "lived experience".	No.	Yes. The author problematises strategic essentialism: it is unavoidable when participatory research gives "people with lived experiences" a voice	Rather no. The author does not raise further research questions yet reflects upon the necessity of and calls for the denaturalisation of "people with lived experience".

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
		experiences of distress/mental health system encounters deploy lived experience as expertise to produce research?	experience" do not have control over how others read their difference. They risk naturalising dominant discourses on mental illness and even tokenism as they embody diversity and inclusion. Their participation remains fragile and depends on self-governance to secure comprehensibility and future funding.	doing in the article.	2. understands mentally ill subjects as socioculturally constituted (Against "Born This Way"), 3. debates experience as risking to naturalise difference, 4. Strategic Essentialism and Some Troubles With "People With Lived Experience", 5. concludes on the gains and risks of embodying lived experience in research).			yet essentialises (e.g.) mental illness.	
21	Lebanese women disability rights activists. War-time experience	Rather yes. The central question remains implicit. It seems to be: How do Lebanese women with disabilities experience activism? What are their stories of resistance?	Rather yes. The interviewed women expressed their awareness of sexism and ableism yet also shared individual acts of resistance. For some, the context of war provided the opportunity to play an active role as an activist	Rather yes. The author does provide some connecting passages /signposting.	Rather yes. The author 1. problematises the assumption that Arab/Muslim women are victims, 2. positions herself, 3. situates the study within feminist Disability Studies, 4. introduces the study in its context, 5. discusses findings of the research, (- how the interviewees became involved as activists,	Rather not comprehensively. Sherene Razack's politics of rescue and Edward Said's take on women in Muslim/Arab societies seem fitting to the topic. However, further postcolonial notions (e.g. Gayatri Spivak's subalternity) could enhance the analysis.	No.	Rather yes. The author problematises that Arab/Muslim women are assumed to be passive victims in patriarchal societies, which is used as a justification for recent wars. Consequently, she centres the perspectives of Lebanese women with disabilities in her study.	No.

No.	Title	Does the paper raise a well-defined question or problem?	Are questions and problems raised answered or addressed conclusively?	Is there a common thread?	Is the argumentation comprehensible, valid and convincing?	How comprehensively is postcolonial, decolonial or indigenous theory received?	Are controversial positions taken into account?	Does the text show new, interesting perspectives?	Are further research questions developed?
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - their experiences of war-time activism, - their awareness of oppression, - the mitigation of oppression and - the need to balance activism and mothering.) <p>6. concludes that listening to Arab/Muslim women with disabilities remains essential.</p>				