



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	Excellent statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Good statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Fair statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Poor statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	
Relevance of the Topic	Highly relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Somewhat relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Marginally relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Not relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	
Importance of the Topic	Great importance to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Somewhat important to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Marginally important to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Not likely to advance thought on archival principles and practices	
Contribution to the Literature	Provides significant original contributions to the literature	Provides important original contributions to the literature	Provides marginal original contributions to the literature	Does not provide original contributions to the literature	
Organization	Excellent organization of ideas and supporting points	Good organization of ideas and supporting points	Fair organization of ideas and supporting points	Poor organization of ideas and supporting points	
Drawing and Building Upon Relevant Literature	Provides an excellent summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a good summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a fair summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a poor summary of the major points in the relevant literature	
Methodology	Research methodology is excellent	Research methodology is good	Research methodology is fair	Research methodology is poor	

Discussion	Thoroughly develops major points with relevant evidence and solid reasoning	Adequately develops major points with evidence and reasoning	Somewhat develops major points with evidence and reasoning	Contains major problems with the quality of the evidence and reasoning	
Conclusion	Excellent conclusion with justification from evidence presented	Good conclusion with justification from evidence presented	Fair conclusion without sufficient justification from evidence presented	Poor or inadequate conclusion	
Mechanics	Few to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Some errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Many errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Major 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):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....