

## Open Peer Review

Smith, B. (2023, May). [A Bibliometric Study of Research on Open Educational Resources and Higher Education, by R. Chandler]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 42-45. doi: 10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7877

-----

**Reviewer:** Brenda Smith

**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 topic is directly related to open education and builds on the bibliometric research methodology of three previous studies but fills a gap due to its focus on academic libraries/librarianship and OER. Given that the article title and the purpose of the article includes academic libraries, a bit more about that would be beneficial - even how highly/lowly placed that the academic library content was related to the others.

### Organization

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

The article is logically organized and adheres to traditional structures (i.e., literature review, methods, results, discussion, etc.). One suggestion is to put a statement about where the academic libraries fit within each section (as applicable) - even if that number is low because it relates to the title and the study's explicit purpose and the article title.

### 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?*

Given the nature of the study, it is clear that the author is familiar with previous work on the subject – both other bibliometric studies on OER and general open education literature. I did not notice any missing recent or seminal works on the subject. I noted that the advanced search string used did not include the acronym OER or the alternate term of “open education resources,” which surprised me., but I don't think would really impact overall results. I also noticed that all three previous related studies used Scopus to gather data, but this study did not. It would be useful to briefly explain the reason(s) for this choice, given that the other three all used this tool. In the results section (page 8, second paragraph), it talks about the 18 LIS journals, were any of them in the list of 34 core journals? That wasn't clear to me (but I suspect they probably weren't on that list). On page 13, the first paragraph, it talks about how academic librarianship overlaps with the field of Education – in what way? As a general discipline? Or, for the purposes of indexing? It also mentions that many academic librarians/research in academic libraries may be published in Education journals. How could you parse that out a bit? Overall, the methodology, approach, and conclusions were sound.

## 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 article was clear and well-written. There were a couple of awkward sentences or slightly unclear connections. For example, on page 13, it talks about how Mishra et al found open textbooks to be a declining research area of OER, but that this research found that it was in the top 20 most frequently used Author's keywords and in the most highly cited articles. Using a “however” or something to separate Mishra's findings and this study would help clarify the difference. For references, there needs to be some copy editing to correct some of the citations related to sentence case titles, including volume/issue information, etc. So, while the article is well written, it would benefit from some very minor copyediting.

## Application:

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

The article provided an interesting glimpse into the publication data about LIS and OER, so yes, it contributes knowledge into the field. I was surprised that LIS literature did not figure more prominently in the results. I had assumed that given how librarians were so prominently seen and talked about in the field of open education, that it would translate into the literature, too. Well, that bubble burst! On the other hand, librarians are often more busy doing the work than publishing about it. And, citation metrics are

only one measure of impact. Many librarians use the literature to inform their own practice, but do not then write/publish themselves, which may (supposition here) belie actual impact. But that's beyond the scope of bibliometrics studies, and just an interesting aside. I found the article enjoyable to read, and I learned quite a bit.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

It was well-written and clearly articulates trends in the literature. It also shows its connections to previous studies. Given that there are similar findings in these studies, it provides further support to the findings and illustrates the major publication trends in the field.

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

The article was well written, so isn't much that could be strengthened. The questions that I had are identified above – e.g., explaining why Scopus not used and expanding on the discussion about how many academic librarians/research in academic libraries may be published in Education journals. Is it possible to look at that more closely? If not in this article, as a general option for future research? Something to consider is adding separate sections or adding a statement in existing section about how academic libraries/librarians research relates/does not relate, given the title of the article and the focus of the study as per the methodology section – just to tie it all together.

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*

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?*

Sound

Overall Evaluation

3- Strong Accept

-----