

## Open Peer Review

Arnold, N. (2022, October). [Review of the article, Conversations with open textbook authors: The factors that help and hinder accessibility, by T. Schultz & E. Azadbakht]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 229-232. doi: 10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7157

-----

**Reviewer:** Nicole Arnold

**Recommendation:** Revisions Required

-----

### 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?*

Yes, this article's topic (OER and web accessibility) is related to the Journal's scope. This is a very important topic. In fact, if a learning object is not accessibility and it is put forth by a university for students to use, there could be legal repercussions. The article also points out that a sizeable population relies on accessibility features in order to read items. In addition to this, with the advent of COVID-19, more and more instruction and learning has moved online. When Libraries were temporarily closed, OERs became more prominent. This topic is not only extremely important, it's also very timely.

### Organization

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

Yes. In addition to results, it also adds a discussion portion, which I think is a very good addition.

### 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 article's analysis is based upon the literature review and the interviews conducted. It is very clear how the author(s) arrive at their conclusions. The article makes use of current literature on this topic, ensuring that their analysis is based off of the current setting of OER and accessibility. As a result of this literature review, the authors opted to fill in more fully an area of research that has yet to be expanded qualitatively.

## 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.*

I had no issues with the writing style or references.

## Application:

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

Yes. The author(s) gives concrete examples of what would help and what would hinder. The author(s) are able to use the interviews conducted to paint a very clear picture of what can be done in the future so that OERs are totally accessible to those with disabilities.

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

The strongest point of this article was the marshaling of interviewees. Their interview pool was very diverse, with interviewees coming from public universities, one smaller public university, and a non for profit group. They also had some interviewees from Canadian institutions. The OERs written by the interviewees also spanned a huge number of subjects. This was very important because of the nature of these subjects. For example, creating a screen readable mathematical formula presents a different type of hardship in comparison to a screen readable word chart. Being able to take all of this into account is very important.

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

This is a small request, but I think using the Pseudonyms more prominently and giving some background on who that Pseudonym is contextually would be helpful. For example, is "Ruthi" from an R1? Or from a small university? Using the pseudonyms more prominently rather than using pronouns would also help with clarity.

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

2- Accept

-----