



# ***APT Bulletin* Peer-review Guidelines**

## **The Peer-review Process**

The peer-review process is critical to the success of the *APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology* as a scholarly journal. It helps the editorial staff at the *Bulletin* understand whether sound preservation practices were followed in a project, whether the ideas proposed and the research conducted are original, and whether an article would make a valuable contribution to the field. Peer reviewers, in turn, gain an early look at the newest manuscripts and the latest preservation work and have a hand in shaping the information that is disseminated about preservation's best practices. Without the expertise of peer reviewers, the *APT Bulletin* would not be able to offer the consistently excellent, cutting-edge information that our audience has come to expect.

As manuscripts come in, we contact potential peer reviewers by means of an email broadcast. Once assigned, manuscripts and accompanying images are emailed to two to three reviewers, who are given approximately two weeks to complete the review (we can usually work with reviewers who might need more time). Details on criteria to use in the reviews and a review form are provided with each manuscript.

The peer-review process is double-blind: peer reviewers do not know who wrote the manuscript, and authors do not know who reviewed it.

Manuscripts submitted to the *APT Bulletin* are assumed to be original work that has not been published previously and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. We rely on reviewers to help ensure that manuscripts conform to the guidelines on previously published material. Please refer to APT's "Guidelines on What Constitutes Previously Published" for what the editor considers to have been previously published.

It is critical that reviewers provide impartial, unbiased reviews. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, we ask potential reviewers not to volunteer for a particular manuscript if they work with the author or for the same firm as the author or if they have worked on the project being discussed. If a reviewer discovers after receiving a manuscript that the reviewer or his or her firm was involved in the project, we ask that the reviewer disqualify himself or herself and notify us as soon as possible so that we can find another reviewer. We will be happy to send such volunteers another manuscript to review in the future.

## **Criteria and Procedures for Peer Review**

Reviewers are asked to consider the following criteria and procedures:

### *General*

1. Does the manuscript contribute new knowledge to the field of preservation technology? Is it worth publishing?
2. Does the manuscript conform to APT's guidelines on previously published material? Also, if you are aware of a previous publication of this material that is not acknowledged in the manuscript, please let us know.



## ***APT Bulletin Peer-review Guidelines***

3. Are the concepts in the manuscript based on thorough research, including investigation of original source materials and a comprehensive knowledge of the subject?
4. Does the manuscript contain purely speculative material?
5. Were sound preservation practices followed?
6. Is material included in the manuscript for commercial advantage?

### *Subject Treatment*

1. Does the title reflect clearly the content of the manuscript?
2. Does the manuscript clearly state its objective?
3. Does the manuscript cover its stated objective?
4. Is there sufficient evidence to support the author's thesis?
5. Is the information accurate and consistent?
6. Is background information treated adequately?
7. Are descriptions clear and presented in sufficient detail?
8. Is the subject closely related to preservation technology and APT's mission? APT's mission is to advance the application of traditional and contemporary technology appropriate to conservation of the built environment and the cultural resources that contribute to its significance.

### *Presentation*

1. Should the text be expanded or condensed?
2. Is the text written clearly and organized logically?
3. Are the images clear, sufficient in number, and used appropriately to illustrate the text?
4. Are the references or citations sufficient?

### *Submitting Your Review*

1. Your comments should be aligned with the intent of the peer-review process: to ensure high quality material and clarity of subject matter being provided to the APT audience and our other readers around the world. Your review should contain constructive criticism. However, any unnecessarily harsh or unkind comments will not be shared with the author.
2. Please do not use the "Comment" function in Microsoft Word unless you remove your user initials.
3. We ask that your comments be as specific as possible, referencing page numbers in the manuscript where appropriate. This will assist the author in making revisions and facilitate the editorial-review process that follows.
4. Please focus on the content of the manuscript rather than on issues of editorial style. The editorial staff will work closely with the authors during the copyediting process.
5. Be sure to include a numerical score at the top of the review form.

Thank you for your time, efforts, and expertise.