Open Peer Review

Reviewer: Emily Bongiovanni

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?

This article is aligned with the scope of the journal. The topic of accessibility in OER is important and not widely discussed in scholarly literature. It is exciting to see more research on accessibility hurdles and progress in OER!

Organization

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

There is good use of sections and I was able to follow the article easily.

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 paper is well researched and the literature review provides good context. The article successfully pulls together themes from the interviewees responses.

I do wonder if in the future the authors would consider including participants who weren't successful in making accessible resources to better understand their hurdles and why they weren't successful, as opposed to only participants who were successful in making accessible resources.

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.

There were no issues with expression or flow.

Application:

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

The article highlights areas in which accessibility support can grow. I think librarians and others supporting the development of OER or managing OER programs will benefit from the information presented in this article.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The scope and research topic is great and will benefit the community.

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

The discussion section could be strengthened with slightly better flow, perhaps an outline of themes to be discussed. It might help to remove the recommendations on planning for accessibility, since this doesn't directly tie to the research.

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?

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