Open Peer Review

Reviewer: Robin Miller

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Scope, Objectives, Content

Is the article in scope for Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education? Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics? Is the topic an important one, or is it trivial or of low priority?

This article is well within the scope of JOERHE and provides interesting, and not often represented, views on the use of OER materials in higher education. This is an important topic, as the authors point out in the article, that doctoral students should be viewed as not only recipients of the benefits associated with the use of OER but also as potential partners with the library for OER promotion (production?) in the future.

Organization

Does the article proceed logically? As applicable, does the article adhere to a recommended structure and the section guideline?

Yes, the article proceeds logically and adheres to recommended structure and section guidelines.

Methodology, Approach, Conclusions

The methodology for data gathering and analysis should be appropriate for the problem addressed. Inferences from data should be sound--the author should not reach unsupported conclusions. Not all papers will use a scientific research methodology, but all should employ sound reasoning and an adequate balance between description and critical analysis. Consider: Is the article factually accurate? Is it clear the

author knows, or has investigated, previous work on the subject of the article? Has the author failed to reference recent or seminal work on the subject?

The authors' methodology, approach, and conclusions are sound and factually accurate. The authors' literature review and references establish a solid foundation and understanding of the OER landscape and show that they are well versed in current conversations surrounding their topic.

Writing Style, References

Please indicate whether there are problems with expression or flow, but do not comment about grammar or basic edits. Do NOT take the time to do copy editing - that will be handled later in the process. However, general comments pointing out problems with style or format are useful.

The writing style is clear and easy to follow.

Application:

Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Yes, the article provides interesting, and underserved, views of the use of OER that should be considered by those working in OER, higher education, and libraries.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The authors' recognition of an area within the OER landscape that has not been actively researched.

What are the weaker points/qualities of the article? How could they be strengthened?

Not necessarily a weak point, but I would have liked to see more detailed inquiry into the future of textbooks and OER. Perhaps even adding another question specifically asking about production of OER by doctoral students and instructors - have you done it, would you do it (or do it again), how do you feel about doctoral students vs. full-time instructors producing OER?

Peer Review Ranking: Scope

Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics?

Relevant

Peer Review Ranking: Clarity

Clarity of expression and flow? Does the article proceed logically?

Clear

Peer Review Ranking: Contribution

Contribution to Higher Education research and/or practice

Contributes

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate?

Appropriate

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate? Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Sound

Overall Evaluation

2-Accept