**International HETL Review (IHR)**

**Reviewer Feedback Form: Academic and Feature Articles**

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. Your review will help the editors make an informed decision about publishing the article and will also provide helpful feedback to the author(s). See also the general reviewer guidelines and editorial policies at <http://hetl.org/editorial-policies/> . For information on specific article criteria/types, see <http://hetl.org/call-for-articles/>. Please return the completed form to the Editor indicated below by the due date. This review is double-blind; please keep it confidential to the parties involved**.**

Editor: **[name]**

Editor’s email address: **[address]**

Article code and title: **[code] [title]**

Reviewer and code: **[code]** **[name]**

Reviewer email address: [address]

Date article sent to reviewer: **[date]**

Date article review due: **[date]**

**Please summarize the article in one or two sentences:**

**Comments for the editor only (will not be shared with authors).**

**Article code, type, and title: [code][type – academic or feature][title]**

1. **Check-list** (on a 5 point scale: 1 = needs significant work to 5 = outstanding or N/A). General comments may be added. **(insert ‘yes’ or tick in relevant cell)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Element** | **1 (article needs to be rewritten) (low score)** | **2 (major changes required)** | **3 (significant changes required)** | **4 (minor change required)** | **5 (little or no change required) (high score)** |
|  | Relevance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Usefulness |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Originality |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Clarity |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Length |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Methodology |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Argument |  |  |  |  |  |

Code:

1. Relevance: e.g., consistent with the journal/conference themes
2. Usefulness: e.g., of interest to the global higher education community
3. Originality: not previously published; has element(s) of novelty
4. Clarity: e.g., readability, research focus and objectives, proper use of English, structure and logical flow
5. Length: meets word length requirements, 4000 – 8000 words
6. Appropriateness of research method(s) and methodology
7. Argument: e.g., uses sound reasoning, logic, and analysis throughout

**Reviewer comment:**

1. **Composition of article (insert ‘yes’ or tick in relevant cell)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Element** | 1. **Poor (low score)** | 1. **Adequate** | 1. **Good** | 1. **Very good** | 1. **Excellent (high score)** |
|  | Title |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abstract |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Keywords |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Introduction |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Literature review (if applicable) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Body of article |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Conclusions & recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | List of references |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Use of citations |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Conformance to APA referencing style |  |  |  |  |  |

**Reviewer comment:**

1. **Overall contribution to the field (highlight as many as appropriate)**
2. Presents important new information and knowledge
3. Confirms the importance of present knowledge
4. Presents a new perspective, issue, or problem definition
5. Presents other significant contribution
6. Little to no contribution to field

**Reviewer comment:**

1. **Recommendation to the Editor (highlight only one)**
2. Accept as is
3. Accept with changes subject to a revision
4. Invite to resubmit after a revision and delay the accept/decline decision after a second review round
5. Decline

**Reviewer comment:**

1. **Confidence you have in your review (highlight only one)**
2. High
3. Moderate
4. Low
5. **Comments to be sent to the author(s) including suggestions for improvement**