



ASPP PEER REVIEW REPORT

You've accepted a very important task. You have agreed to review a work in your field of expertise to help the Publications Committee of the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program determine whether an ASPP grant should assist its publication. Your detailed and frank report is critical to the ASPP's process.

NOTES

The Publications Committee examines the peer review reports, the author's response and excerpts of the work in order to decide on a funding recommendation for the work. When a work is approved for a grant, it is on condition that the work will be published by an eligible Canadian publisher and will be copy edited before publication. In some cases, the Publications Committee will invite resubmission from an author after appropriate revision.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your identity as a reviewer is strictly confidential. Your report will be sent to the author anonymously. If the application has been submitted by a publisher, the ASPP will share your identity with the publisher in strict confidence.

REPORT FOR MONOGRAPHS AND COLLECTIVE WORKS

Please answer, in detail, the following questions:

1. Are the objectives of the work clear?
2. Is the scholarship sound? Is the author thoroughly acquainted with the literature on the subject?
3. To what audience is the work directed?
4. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the work, relating to style, inaccuracies, omissions, or any other points, either substantive or editorial?
5. Is the presentation of the work (grammar, inclusion of notes and bibliography, accuracy of notes, bibliography, and citations, etc...) of professional standard? Is the work readable? Would this work benefit by being shortened or lengthened? If so, please suggest what might be condensed or expanded.
6. How important is it that this work be published, in light of the scholarship available? Is the work:
 - a) A serious advance in state-of-the-art research?
 - b) A major contribution to research?
 - c) A contribution which, while modest, is interesting, and which can be recommended for publication?
 - d) A very modest and limited contribution which can be recommended for publication?
 - e) No contribution to the field; not recommended for publication?
7. Is the work acceptable for publication?
 - a) Yes

b) No

c) Not in its present form but a revised work may be publishable (in this case, please indicate the nature of the revisions required)

REPORT FOR CRITICAL EDITIONS

Please answer, in detail, the following questions:

1. Is the publication of this critical edition justified in terms of such criteria as the significance, availability, and textual complexity of the work(s) upon which it is centered?

2. Towards what audience is the edition directed?

3. Has the copytext, if there is one, been well chosen and emended in the light of the stated editorial principles and rationale? Are the authoritative versions of the work identified? Is the detailed description of the history of the composition, printing and publication of the work provided?

4. Are the editorial principles clearly stated, coherent, and appropriate? Is a sufficiently detailed rationale for the principles provided? Are the editorial notes (and appendix(ces), if any) accurate and complete? Is the introductory material (preface, introduction) adequate? Is the scholarship sound?

5. Is the presentation of the work (grammar, inclusion of notes and bibliography, accuracy of notes, bibliography, and citations, etc) of professional standard? Would this work benefit by being shortened or lengthened? If so, please suggest what might be condensed or expanded.

6. Critical editions funded by the ASPP must make contain a significant analytical component. How does this critical edition make an original contribution to knowledge?

7. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of any portion or aspect of the edition - for example, omissions, inaccuracies, substantive or stylistic shortcomings that should be rectified?

8. How important is it that this edition be published, in light of existing editions and scholarship? Is this edition:

a) A significant contribution to research?

b) A major contribution to research?

c) A contribution which, while modest, is interesting, and which can be recommended for publication?

d) A very modest and limited contribution which can be recommended for publication?

e) No contribution to the field; not recommended for publication?

9. Is the work acceptable for publication?

a) Yes

b) No

c) Not in its present form but a revised work may be publishable (in this case, please indicate the nature of the revisions required)