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Reviewer Evaluation Form
for Manuscripts

Title of Article: ____________________________________________

Article #: _________________________________________________

Review Due Date: __________________________________________

Context: The focus of LPR is to promote excellent literacy education through improvement in the education of teachers. We consider literacy to encompass all dimensions of communication, such as art, technology, photography, and various other semiotic systems.

Instructions: Please review the manuscript provided to you. LPR Online asks that you complete the rubric below and provide relevant and constructive feedback and suggestions where indicated. Also, please indicate your decision to accept or reject the manuscript for publication. When complete, send this form as an attachment to LPROnlinejournal@gmail.com for processing.

Technical Guidelines for Authors: Submissions may vary in length, but must be double-spaced, 12-point type, Times New Roman font, in English. All submissions should strictly adhere to APA 7th edition, include an abstract of 100 words max and an author note of 50 words max. Articles with multiple authors may have an author’s note of 75 words max. All submissions should include detailed methodology, a solid theoretical framework, and must offer relevant implications. Only articles written in exemplary academic writing will be considered. Please reference the academic writing checklist included below for full writing requirements. Submissions may include examples, visuals, and other forms of representation. Any graphics located within written submissions should be in JPEG format. Images submitted for cover art should be in GIF format.
## Reviewer Evaluation Rubric for Manuscripts

### General Expectations:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This article addresses the aims of the journal and the theme of this issue.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This article is timely, relevant, and would be interesting to the journal’s scholarly audience.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This article expands the field of research by asking questions or providing insights that deepen what is already known about the topic.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The title of the article accurately portrays the content of the article.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General Expectations Continued:

5. If this submission portrays research, the manuscript contains a comprehensive methodology section, a theoretical perspective/framework, and relevant implications meaningful for the journal’s academic audience.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

General Expectation Comments:
Ideas and Content Score:

**Score 4:** The writing is exceptionally clear, focused, and interesting. It holds the reader’s attention throughout. Main ideas stand out and are developed by strong support and rich details suitable to audience and purpose. The writing is characterized by:
- exceptional clarity, focus, and control.
- main idea(s) stand out.
- supporting, relevant, carefully selected details; when appropriate, use of resources provides strong, accurate, credible support.
- a thorough, balanced, in-depth explanation / exploration of the topic; the writing makes connections and shares insights.
- content and selected details are well-suited to audience and purpose.

**Score 3:** The writing is clear, focused, and interesting. It holds the reader’s attention. Main ideas stand out and are developed by supporting details suitable to audience and purpose. The writing is characterized by:
- general clarity and focus.
- main idea(s) stand out.
- supporting, relevant details; uses resources that generally provides accurate, credible support.
- a balanced explanation / exploration of the topic; the writing makes connections and shares basic insights.
- content and selected details are generally appropriate to audience and purpose.

**Score 2:** The writing is clear and focused. The reader can easily understand the main ideas. Support is present, although it may be limited or rather general. The writing is characterized by:
- an easily identifiable purpose.
- clear main idea(s).
- supporting details relevant but overly general or limited in places; when appropriate, resources are used to provide accurate support.
- a topic is explored / explained, although developmental details may occasionally be out of balance with the main idea(s); some connections and insights may be present.
- content and selected details are relevant, but perhaps not consistently well-chosen for audience and purpose.

**Score 1:** The reader can understand the main ideas, although they may be overly broad or simplistic, and the results may not be effective. Supporting detail is often limited, insubstantial, overly general, or occasionally slightly off topic. The writing is characterized by:
- an easily identifiable purpose and main idea(s).
- predictable or overly obvious main ideas; or points that echo observations heard elsewhere; or a close retelling of another work.
- support is attempted, but developmental details are often limited, uneven, somewhat off-topic, predictable, or too general (e.g., a list of underdeveloped points).
- details may not be well-grounded in credible resources; they may be based on clichés, stereotypes, anecdotes, or questionable sources of information.
- difficulties when moving from general observations to specifics.

**Reviewer Score:**

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
## Reviewer Evaluation Rubric

### For Manuscripts

#### Academic Writing Checklist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author limits use of weak ‘ing’ verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article is written in Active Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author limits use of adverbs and adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author excludes unnecessary usage of the word “that”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences do not end in prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author uses “who” not “that” with people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author avoids wordiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comma is always used before the word “which” except in the phrase “In which case”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author opts for “that” or “what” in place of “which” when possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author never uses words like “very” or “really” unless cited as part of someone’s conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs begin with on-topic sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing is appropriate for the audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors strictly adhere to APA 7th Edition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author avoids Jargon when possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary is varied but consistent in terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Writing Comments:
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Overall Constructive Feedback and Suggestions:

Reviewer Decision:

☐ Accept
☐ Reject