

## Peer Review Form

Article No \_\_\_\_\_ Article Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

*Instructions for the Peer Reviewer:* For each criterion, please highlight or shade the box that best matches your judgment. Feel free to provide comments for each criterion. You also may provide additional comments for the author and/or editor at the end of the form. **Please complete review within three weeks.**

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments
Statement of Problem or Purpose	<u>Excellent</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Good</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Fair</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Poor</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	
Relevance of the Topic	<u>Highly relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the journal	<u>Somewhat relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the journal	<u>Marginally relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the journal	<u>Not relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the journal	
Importance of the Topic	<u>Great importance</u> to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	<u>Somewhat important</u> to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	<u>Marginally important</u> to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	<u>Not likely</u> to advance thought on archival principles and practices	
Contribution to the Literature	Provides <u>significant</u> original contributions to the literature	Provides <u>important</u> original contributions to the literature	Provides <u>marginal</u> original contributions to the literature	<u>Does not provide</u> original contributions to the literature	
Organization	<u>Excellent</u> organization of ideas and supporting points	<u>Good</u> organization of ideas and supporting points	<u>Fair</u> organization of ideas and supporting points	<u>Poor</u> organization of ideas and supporting points	
Drawing and Building Upon Relevant Literature	Provides an <u>excellent summary</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>good summary</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>fair summary</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>poor summary</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	
Methodology	Research methodology is <u>excellent</u>	Research methodology is <u>good</u>	Research methodology is <u>fair</u>	Research methodology is <u>poor</u>	
Discussion	<u>Thoroughly develops</u> major points with relevant evidence and solid reasoning	<u>Adequately develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	<u>Somewhat develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	Contains <u>major problems</u> with the quality of the evidence and reasoning	
Conclusion	<u>Excellent</u> conclusion with justification from evidence presented	<u>Good</u> conclusion with justification from evidence presented	<u>Fair</u> conclusion without sufficient justification from evidence presented	<u>Poor</u> or inadequate conclusion	
Mechanics	<u>Few</u> to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Some</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Many</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Major</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	

Recommendation:

ACCEPT. The article is acceptable for publication. Minor corrections may need to be made.

REVISE and RESUBMIT. The article is not acceptable as submitted. Encourage the author to revise and resubmit.

REJECT. The article does not merit publication.

Additional Comments for the Author:

Additional Comments for the Editor (will not be shared with the author):