

# Article Review Guideline

*Note: Remember to use your own words while reviewing the article in light of each of the following sections.*

## 1. Introduction

- ❖ State the objectives (goals or purpose) of the article. What is the article's domain (topic area)?
- ❖ State the article's intended audience. At what level is it written, and what general background should the reader have; what general background materials should the reader be familiar with to understand the article?
- ❖ Explain the appropriateness of the Journal. Why is the journal appropriate (or inappropriate) for this article? (Check the mission statement or purpose of the journal itself from its cover or its Web site.)

## 2. Summary

- ❖ State the problem or opportunity being addressed.
- ❖ Describe the proposed solution (the solution could be a new model or a theory that explains the problem).
- ❖ State the evidence put forth that the solution is appropriate.

## 3. Results

- ❖ Briefly summarize the important points (observations, conclusions, findings).

## 4. Contributions

- ❖ Do you believe the article contributes something to the knowledge of researchers in a research field? If yes, in what terms? If you do not believe so, explain why?

## 5. Foundation

- ❖ State the theoretical foundations the article is built on (if any).

## 6. General Critique

- ❖ Explain your opinions of how well (or poorly) the authors did their research and presented the research results in the article.

You can approach section number six in terms of questions like:

- ✓ Does it build upon the appropriate foundation (i.e., upon appropriate prior research)?
- ✓ Did the authors choose the correct approach, and then execute it properly?
- ✓ How confident are you in the article's results, and why?
- ✓ Are its ideas really new, or do the authors simply repackage old ideas and perhaps give them a new name?
- ✓ Do the authors discuss everything they promise in the article's introduction and outline?
- ✓ What are the article's shortcomings (faults) and limitations (boundaries)? Did it discuss all of the important aspects and issues in its domain (topic area)?
- ✓ In what way should the article have made a contribution, but then did not?
- ✓ Do the authors make appropriate comparisons to similar events, cases or occurrences?
- ✓ How complete and thorough a job did the authors do? Do the authors include an adequate discussion, analysis and conclusions? Did they justify everything adequately? Did they provide enough background information for the intended audience to understand it?
- ✓ Were there adequate and appropriate examples and illustrations?