

## Open Peer Review

Hollich, S. (2022, October). [Review of the article, Just one textbook? Student perceptions and preferences for open and affordable educational resources, by E. Nelson & C. Riehman-Murphy]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 268-270. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7173

-----

**Reviewer:** Shanna Hollich

**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?*

The article is very much within the scope of the Journal of OER in Higher Ed. I think the topic here is an important one as well. While there is a proliferation of research regarding student perception of OER and their relative value to more traditionally-published classroom materials, this particular article is filling a necessary niche and has some novel findings.

### Organization

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

The article proceeds logically and the overall structure is good. Specific comments available in the document, but article's structure and sections are all well done.

### 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 methodology here is good. The approach and research design makes sense, the authors are very clear and up-front about the limitations of the design, particularly with respect to influence from outside factors

such as COVID-19, and the conclusions they draw are factually accurate and flow logically. The article is well-grounded in the existing literature.

## 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.*

No problems with writing style or references were observed.

## Application:

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

Absolutely. The findings in this article are the first I've seen of this kind, and they confirm and enhance anecdotal insights that librarians and practitioners in the area of open education have noticed for several years. I'm looking forward to seeing future researchers build upon this work even further.

## What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

This article is very strong. It is well-written and well-organized, and it situates itself very nicely within its own niche in the field of OER research and student use and perceptions of OER. It's absolutely publishable in its current state.

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

No real weak points identified, the article is strong as-is. There are some minor issues that could be addressed that would make the article even stronger, and these are noted as comments in the Word document itself.

## Peer Review Ranking: Scope

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

Highly Relevant

Peer Review Ranking: Clarity

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

Very Clear

Peer Review Ranking: Contribution

*Contribution to Higher Education research and/or practice*

Highly Contributes

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

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

Highly 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?*

Highly Sound

Overall Evaluation

3-Strong Accept

-----