

***Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship***  
**Referee Feedback Form for ARTICLES**

Thank you for agreeing to review the designated manuscript for *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*. **Please include the manuscript number in the subject line of all email correspondence concerning this submission.**

Return the completed evaluation form to the Refereed Articles Editor by the deadline shown.

**Manuscript Number:**

**Manuscript Title:**

**Deadline for return of comments to Editor:**

Instructions

Your comments, along with those of one or more other referees, will form the basis for the decision whether to publish this manuscript in ISTL. We ask you to rate the manuscript on the criteria below, using the questions within each criterion as guides for assessing the quality of the manuscript. Provide specific and meaningful comments immediately below the questions wherever appropriate, especially if the answer is 'no.' (Of course, positive comments are always appreciated by the authors as well!) Your comments should communicate to the author what is unclear or unsupported; how passages might be improved; what modifications are necessary before the paper should be accepted; or what specific reasons resulted in a recommendation not to publish.

You are strongly encouraged to insert sidebar Comments in the document using the Track Changes feature in Word. This is the most helpful form of feedback for authors in the revision process. Please do NOT make direct/extensive edits to the text for style, grammar, spelling, etc.—copyediting will be done later in the process. Pointing out specific parts of the text that need work using sidebar comments is sufficient. General comments about the writing quality should be included in the Structure and Organization category below.

Thank you for your time and effort carefully reading the attached manuscript. Peer review is a critical component of the scholarly publication process, and your reviews ensure the quality of manuscripts published in ISTL.

### ISTL Review Criteria

Please rate the manuscript on each of the criteria listed below, as Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor, to provide an overall indication of the quality of that aspect. Don't forget to indicate your overall assessment of whether the paper should be accepted, reconsidered, or rejected.

#### **Originality: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**

Is this a new and original contribution?

Does the manuscript add meaningfully to our understanding of the topic addressed?

#### **Context: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**

Does the article provide appropriate context for the investigation?

Is the literature review relevant, thorough, and current?

Does the author discuss the results in comparison with other published research?

#### **Research Methods and Design: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**

Are the methods valid and clearly described?

#### **Results and Impact: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**

Is the interpretation of the data logical and consistent?

Has the author considered alternative explanations for the data?

Does the author discuss appropriate broader applications/implications of work?

#### **Structure and Organization: (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)**

Is the information in the paper presented and organized logically?

Does the abstract adequately summarize the article's content?

Is the objective of the paper clearly stated in the introduction?

Are data (tables, charts, etc.) presented clearly?

Are illustrations and figures legible and do they complement/augment the text? Are captions succinct yet complete?

Is the paper written in clear, grammatical English, in a style that is easy to understand?

Are the cited references [correctly formatted](#)?

#### **YOUR RECOMMENDATION:**

The article

( ) should be accepted with minor revisions as indicated.

( ) should be reconsidered after major revisions as indicated.

( ) should not be accepted for the reasons indicated.

#### **Other Comments:**