

Re-viewers Report Forms

Below is a summary of the question sets asked of reviewers by respondent, in a summarized format. They represent all responses from an ISWORLD request in July 2004, in no particular order. Most required the reviewer to provide a numerical score response to each question; some asked for a textual response. In a separate document these question sets were rearranged by question topic (e.g. those asking about significance or importance).

- Practical & Managerial Significance?
 - Appropriateness for the Journal?
 - Literature Review?
 - Clarity of Research Issues?
 - Adequacy of Methodology?
 - Quality of Analysis?
 - Significance of Research Contribution?
 - Quality of Presentation?
 - Organization of Manuscript?
-

- Adequacy of literature review
 - Quality of research design
 - Sufficiency of data analysis
 - Legitimacy of conclusions
 - Potential of recommendations
 - Quality of Writing
-

- Significance of research problem and/or theoretical ideas
 - Thoroughness in the review of the literature
 - Clarity of the research questions/hypotheses
 - Appropriateness of the research method (e.g., sampling, instrumentation, data analysis, etc.)
 - Presentation clarity of the manuscript
 - Contribution to HRD theory and research
 - Implications for HRD practice
-

- Importance of Problem
 - Soundness of Methodology
 - Supportive/Convincing Conclusions and Inferences
 - General Organization and Presentation
-

- How important is the research and/or theoretical problem? How well-defined is the purpose?
 - How well-developed and appropriate are the theoretical frameworks and literature reviews?
 - How sound are the methodological approaches?
 - How well-supported and convincing are the inferences and conclusions? Are the theoretical and practical implications appropriately indicated?
 - How well-organized, well-written, and readable is the manuscript?
-

- Significance and originality
 - Scholarship and cogency
 - Audience
 - Coverage
 - Style and literary quality
-

- Is the topic relevant?
 - Is the treatment new or newsmaking?
 - Is the literature review adequate to support the framework presented?
 - Is the framework clear?
 - Is the evidence, discussion, description clear and convincing and does it match the framework?
 - Does the paper apply standards appropriate to method (if quantitative then defensible, if descriptive then thorough enough to reflect academic responsibility)
 - Is the paper well-written, well organized
-

- A good paper tells "a good story"
-

- What was done? (e.g. a research for ...)
 - Why was it done? (e.g. research relevance)
 - How was it done? (e.g. research methodology)
 - How well it was done? (e.g. theoretically robustness and rigor of research methodology)
 - What are the new issues here? (e.g. findings)
-

- Does the manuscript address a new issue in business and/or technical communication, or offer additional insights on a recurrent issue? If not, could you indicate how the topic might be altered to provide fresher directions?

- Does the manuscript suit the enclosed *JBTC* guidelines for an article, short feature, or commentary? If not, could you suggest changes that might make the manuscript acceptable?
 - Is the discussion well organized? Are the points clearly developed? If necessary, suggest specific changes that might improve the organization and the clarity of the manuscript.
 - Has the author cited the relevant literature? Please indicate any additional sources that should be consulted.
 - If the article is an empirical study, is the methodology sound?
-

- Discuss two good things about this paper
 - Discuss two bad things about this paper
-

- Philosophical worth of the paper. This paper is ...
 - Originality. The views presented in this paper are ...
 - Scholarship. The paper reflects the current state of the literature in the relevant area(s) ...
 - Clarity and liveliness. Papers should be both clear and lively enough to hold the listeners' attention. This paper is ...
-

- Appeal:
 - Significance and Originality:
 - Scholarship:
 - Length:
 - Style and Literary Quality:
-

- Are the research question and the research aims and objectives clearly articulated?
- Has the author adequately reviewed the literature?
- Have any key papers been omitted from the review?
- Has the literature been subject to an insightful critique or just listed?
- Has the author defined the current 'knowledge boundary' and identified how he/she proposes to move that boundary forward?
- Have the theoretical underpinnings of the research project been clearly articulated?
- Is there conceptual clarity?
- Do the conjectures to be tested flow logically from the theoretical base?
- Is the methodology appropriate for the testing of these conjectures given the underpinning theory?

- Have the concepts been adequately operationalised and have these operationalisations adequately justified?
 - Has the approach to evidence collection been properly designed and has it generated robust evidence?
 - Is the sample size/base of evidence adequate for the research design?
 - Have the techniques been properly applied?
 - Have I been given enough information to let me make up my own mind about the reliability and validity of the results?
 - Have the conjectures been refuted or not?
 - Have the findings been adequately assessed in the context of the literature review and existing theory?
 - Are the findings of academic and/or practitioner significance?
 - Has the candidate done what they claimed they would do in the introduction?
 - Are there any logical inconsistencies?
 - Do the conclusions properly 'close down' all aspects of the research?
 - Is there a contribution to knowledge and, if so, what is it?
 - Do I feel comfortable that this person is really an expert in their field?
-

- Is the paper of interest to a reasonable segment of [our] community?
 - Is the paper logically and technically correct?
 - Is the research methodology rigorous and sound?
 - Are the title and abstract appropriate?
 - Does the paper make a sufficient contribution to research so as to warrant publication?
 - Are the references appropriate and complete?
 - Is the use of theory appropriate and complete?
 - Is the English satisfactory?
 - Is the paper of interest to practitioners?
-

- Originality:
 - Technical Quality:
 - Significance:
 - Clarity:
 - Relevance:
-

- Theoretical/Conceptual Base
- Relevant to the workshop CFP
- Originality

- Clarity/Organisation
 - Mechanics/Grammar
 - Provokes discussion
-

- Originality of research:
 - Clarity of objectives:
 - Relevance of issues examined:
 - Rigor of methods employed:
 - Quality of evidence/arguments presented:
 - Appropriateness of conclusions:
 - Quality of writing:
 - Contribution to practice:
 - Contribution to research:
-

- Relevance
 - Content
 - Please summarize what you view as the key point(s)
 - Is the manuscript technically sound?
 - What do you see as this manuscript's contribution to the literature in this field?
 - What do you see as the strongest aspect of this manuscript?
 - What do you see as the weakest aspect of this manuscript?
 - Presentation
 - Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate?
 - Does the manuscript contain title, abstract, and/or keywords?
 - Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references?
 - References are sufficient and appropriate
 - Important references are missing; more references are needed
 - Number of references are excessive
 - Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
 - How would you rate the organization of the manuscript?
 - Is the manuscript focused?
 - Is the length of the manuscript appropriate for the topic?
 - Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript
-

- Significance in contribution
- Theoretical soundness
- Research method
- Originality

- Clarity in paper presentation
 - Relevance to this journal
-

- Significance to theory and practice
 - Originality novelty
 - Relevance to the call for papers
 - Readability and organization
-

- Significance of the topic
 - Appropriateness to xx Conference:
 - Adequacy of the literature review:
 - Development of concepts/hypotheses:
 - Quality of research design:
 - Adequacy of data analysis:
 - Legitimacy of conclusions:
 - Significance for practice:
 - Contribution to the field:
 - Clarity of presentation:
-

- Relevance to journal
 - Technical content
 - Originality
 - Significance/Value to international audience
 - Clarity/Organisation
 - Mechanics/Grammar
-

- Importance to topic of track/conference:
 - Originality, novelty of results:
 - Scientific contents, technical correctness:
 - Writing skills, format, clarity:
 - Use of English:
-

- Likely significance and potential contribution to the field:
 - Strength of theoretical foundations:
 - Quality of the method or analytical techniques:
 - Clarity of paper's organisation and writing:
 - Likelihood of drawing and keeping an audience:
-

- Topic is RELEVANT to xx Membership
 - Clear and well-defined OBJECTIVES
 - Paper is unique or important CONTRIBUTION to the field:
 - Paper is unique or important CONTRIBUTION to the understanding of the field
 - METHODOLOGY: (e.g., research design, statistical methods, instruments, data analysis correct and appropriate:
 - EVIDENCE supports author arguments and objectives
 - QUALITY of WRITING is clear and grammatically correct
 - Paper is WELL-ORGANIZED with logical flow of argument.
 - Appropriate REFERENCES are cited
 - What is new that we didn't know before
-

- Popularity of the subject
 - Appropriateness for this journal
 - Adequacy of literature review
 - Adequacy of theoretical framework
 - Quality of research design
 - Adequacy of data analysis
 - Contributions to the literature
 - Legitimacy of
 - Practical/Managerial significance
 - Clarity of presentation
-

- Interest to community
 - Literature review/theoretical base
 - Appropriate methodology and analysis
 - Results and discussion
 - Language and expression
-

- The most exciting and interesting idea in the paper was:
- The strongest point about the way that you presented this idea was:
- In reading the paper I found that the clarity of your ideas was hindered by:
- The quality of the conceptual analysis and theoretical development would be enhanced by the following three actions:
- The quality of the data gathering and empirical analysis would be enhanced by the following three actions:
- With revisions, this paper would be appropriate for the following three journals:
- The following three issues would need to be addressed to improve the paper for submission in the recommended journals:

- I finished the paper thinking that it might be more persuasive if you omitted:
 - Relative to the theme of the conference on xx measurement, design and use I found the following two ideas to be attractive and novel:
-

- What was the thesis, the argument (conclusion, knowledge claim) as identified by the examiner? Was it empirically falsifiable and sufficiently novel? Was an alternative argument considered?
 - What (in the opinion of the critiquer) was the object, thing or phenomenon under study? The object of the argument? Was it well scoped, defined, and contrasted through a literature review (including prior research)?
 - From what perspective (frame) was the object studied? From what perspective was the object in the argument studies? What is the lens, theory, intellectual frame, concern, or worldview used on the object under study? Was it well scoped, defined, and contrasted, through a literature review (including prior research)?
 - Definitions and language? Were all key words defined with consideration of alternative interpretations?
 - Motivation for Study? Was the importance of the research to academics, practitioners and the researchers themselves, fully explained? What was the problem in need of research?
 - Sufficient and convincing supporting evidence? What evidence was brought to support the argument/conclusion/knowledge claim, was it convincing, novel, insightful? Would it have stood up in court? Were the counter evidence and arguments fully considered? Was all available empirical evidence sought? Were all those mentioned in the research given a voice?
 - Implications, so-what? What were the recommendations, how should people act differently as a result of this research? Has the research improved peoples' choices, how so?
-

- Does the title accurately reflect the content and of the Paper?
 - Is the abstract sufficiently concise and informative?
 - Do the keywords provide adequate index entries for this paper?
 - In the introduction, is the purpose of the paper clearly stated?
 - Does the paper achieve its declared purpose?
 - Do the figures and tables aid the clarity of the paper?
 - Are the English and syntax of the paper satisfactory?
 - Is the paper concise? (If not, please indicate which parts might be cut?)
 - Does the paper develop a logical argument or a theme?
 - Do the conclusions sensibly follow from the work that is reported?
 - Are the references authoritative and representative?
-
- Is the paper interesting or relevant for an international audience?
 - Is the overall quality suitable for inclusion in this journal?
-

- Abstract clear and concise? includes all important information on project, clearly outlines conclusions and addresses objectives/hypotheses Research
- Problem clearly stated and area defined, importance demonstrated
- Hypotheses and/or research objectives clearly stated Hypotheses and/or research objectives appropriate and testable or achievable
- Important terms and/or assumptions clearly defined
- Literature Review Refers to major work relevant to topic Leads to research problem/hypothesis Logical development Identifies strengths/weaknesses of previous research Establishes clear relationship of problem to previous research
- Theoretical concepts and techniques are reviewed/explained
- Research Method Addresses each objective No major weaknesses Appropriate to answer questions/hypotheses Fully described and justified Assumptions and limitations stated Appropriate steps taken to minimise bias Data Collection Carried out appropriately Problems noted and validity of data established Data Analysis Appropriate analytical techniques used Demonstrates understanding of techniques used Results Clearly presented Appropriate use of tables, figures Discussion Compares results with previous work Explains differences Weaknesses honestly conceded and discuss appropriately Suggestions for further research Conclusion Clearly stated Substantiated by the evidence presented Related to hypotheses/objectives of the research General report
- Format is consistent with guidelines Logically organised Clear writing style Few spelling/typographic errors Layout and referencing consistent with Style Guide format.
- Does the author cover everything promised in the introduction?
- Does the author provide adequate motivation?
- Does the author provide adequate background information?
- Are all descriptions clear? Are the tables and figures clear? Do they make sense on their own or only if one has read the text carefully? Are there too many? Would an additional table or figure help? Would an example help?
- Are the research contributions clear? Are the contributions significant?
- Is the approach clearly explained and well laid out? Does the author justify each of the points made?
- Are the equations, algorithms, methods, experiments, and conclusions: correct, robust comprehensive and sensible?
- Is the research properly ground in the literature?
- Has the author expressed the limitations of the research and the author's approach?
- Has the author performed a complete analysis and drawn insightful conclusions?
- Has the author described his or her future research plans? Is it clear where the research described in this paper will lead and what the next step will be?
- Is the conclusion significant? Is it just a rehash of the paper? Does it provide new synthesis or insights? Does it leave the reader excited about the research, the research domain or the future?

- Does the author use important, current and adequate citations? Are there too many citations? Are any irrelevant or insignificant? Are they at an adequate level for the publication (e.g., research oriented vs. trade journals; technical reports vs. journal articles)? Are there too many citations to the author's own work? Can you suggest any missing citations the author may have overlooked?

-----end-----