

Academic Perspectives in Higher Education (APHE) Editorial Comments Form

Thank you for reviewing for APHE!

Questions to Guide Reading

1. Is there a stated goal or purpose? Is the issue or topic with which it deals important?
2. Does the article fulfill its stated goal? Does the content of the article expand our knowledge? Is the work original and fresh?
3. Is the article fair and respectful?
4. As a research article, is there an appropriate review of the literature associated with the topic?
5. Does the article properly cite its sources?
6. How would you judge the quality of the author's writing? Is the prose style clear and precise? Are there many grammatical errors?
7. Are sources adequately and properly cited?
8. If the article contains tables, figures, or appendices, are they useful? Which, if any, could be deleted?
9. Is the article appropriately organized and are the headings indicative of content?
10. Is the length of the article appropriate to the subject matter it considers?
11. What are the strengths of the article?
12. What are the weaknesses of the article? Is there a germ of a good idea, but one that is perhaps executed poorly?

Providing Feedback to Author(s)

Your comments may be shared directly with the author(s) in order to help them improve their research and writing. For this reason, when you provide comments please keep this in mind and:

- be objective and constructive in your reviews and provide feedback that will help the authors to improve their article.
- be specific in your criticisms, and provide evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements such as, 'this work has been done before', to help editors in their evaluation and decision and in fairness to the authors.
- be aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues that are due to the authors writing in a language that is not their own, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.
- make clear which suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

What is your recommendation?

Accept as is.

Modify: Needs minor revisions as noted in "Reviewer's comments to the author(s)," below.

Major modification: Review again and reconsider if author(s) revised as you have recommended.

Reject for reasons noted in Reviewer's comments to the editorial staff.

Please check this box if you are willing to review subsequent revisions of this article.

Reviewer's comments to the editorial staff:

Reviewer's comments to the author(s):