

*Submitted Connie Foster, Editor, January 7, 2009*

**Serials Review**  
**PEER REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS**

DATE:

TO:

MANUSCRIPT TITLE:

The enclosed manuscript has been submitted to *Serials Review* for consideration. Because I appreciate your knowledge of relevant issues and want to publish the best manuscripts possible, I would be very grateful for your assistance as a peer reviewer. If you are willing to help, please read the paper and return it with your comments by (*date*). Peer review remains the foundation of outstanding library literature.

The peer review process is intended to provide the author with a *solid yet constructive critique* of the paper under consideration. Any and all comments/suggestions to help the author make improvements are very welcome and strongly encouraged. When reviewing the paper, please keep in mind the following criteria:

CONTENT/WRITING/ORGANIZATION

- Is the manuscript relevant to *SR*'s aims and scope? These are quite broad, encompassing all phases of serials management and bibliography, relevant automation, publishing practices and trends, journal use studies, e-journals, automation/subscription agent issues, etc.
- Is the issue or problem under consideration important? Even if it covers “old ground,” does the author present original viewpoints or contribute to a new understanding of familiar material?
- Does the author provide the reader with context for the paper? For example, does s/he provide a review of relevant literature? Would you suggest any changes to the articles cited?
- If the paper presents a case study, will the problems and solutions described have wide applicability or appeal? In your opinion, does the paper pass the “so what?” test?
- If the article presents original research, is the methodology sound? Are the conclusions original? Insightful? Well presented? Do you see any logical flaws, omissions or other shortcomings in the paper?
- Does the author provide sufficient background/context on the environment in which the program/project/innovation/research took place?

- Would you say that the general scholarship of the piece is (a) superior; (b) adequate; (c) inadequate? If (b) or (c), why did you choose this rating, and how might the paper be improved? Please be as specific as possible.
- If the author used illustrative matter or sidebars to enhance or supplement the text, are these well presented? Do they add value? If the author did not use illustrations or sidebars, would you suggest that some be added? Would you delete illustrations the author has included?
- Regarding the clarity of writing and organization of the paper: is the paper readable and well organized? Does it make good use of headings and subheadings to organize the paper? FYI, we follow *The Chicago Manual of Style* (latest ed.).

Based on your review of the manuscript, what is your overall recommendation?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1) Accept without modification.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Accept pending revisions as specified on attached page(s).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3) Request another opinion. Suggested reviewer \_\_\_\_\_.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4) Reject. Comments and reasons are on the attached page(s).

Connie Foster  
Editor, *Serials Review*, v.28-