

DisLIS Review Rubrics

Peer review rubrics used by the DisLIS journal. Reviewers, go to the section you're reviewing for:

[Media Reviews](#)

[Article Reviews](#)

Media Reviews (Books, Games, etc.)

Hello,

Thank you for agreeing to do peer review for *DisLIS*! This set of guidelines is a living document, so if you have any questions or suggestions about how to improve them, please contact the editor you're working with directly or send a message to the editorial board at dislisjournal@gmail.com.

Tools you'll need:

- The [review rubric](#)
- The review (in PDF or .doc format)
- Word processing software

Amount of time you'll need:

- It depends on the complexity of review, the complexity of the comments you need to make, and your experience doing this kind of work: **give yourself at least 30 minutes**

Process:

1. Read the review
2. Read the review again while looking at the review rubric and compare the review with the rubric:
 - a. Do all the elements of the review reach the Accept level?
 - i. If yes: Great! Add a comment saying that, upload the document, and you're done!
 - ii. If no:
 1. Identify those parts of the review where maybe the phrasing is unclear or the discussion of disability is deficit-based or it's missing descriptions about the artistic components of a graphic novel, etc.
 2. Provide coaching to help the author move those parts of the review closer to Accept. If something is unclear, ask what the intended meaning is. (See 3b for examples.)
 3. If a reviewer takes a [deficit approach](#) to disability, depending on the specific circumstance, it may be appropriate to suggest alternative ways of talking about it for review purposes (e.g., directing them to the [Disability Language Style Guide](#), Mad Pride

resources, the work of Nick Walker, etc.). It is also completely ok to contact the editor directly: we may need to have a one-on-one discussion with the reviewer to work through the issue care-fully.

3. Provide feedback

- a. Word: If you are able to download a Word version, use the Comments feature to provide suggestions. (You don't need to pay attention to copy edits outside of clarity concerns, but for those of you who find it hard to resist the temptation: use Track Changes for that.)
- b. PDF: If you can only download the PDF version and don't have tools to convert it to Word, make your suggestions in a separate document.
 - i. Example:
 - 1. In paragraph 2, sentence 2 you talk about characters "crossing the binary of gender presentation" - does this mean that they are explicitly trans or nonbinary? Or is the discussion focused specifically on presentation rather than identity?
 - 2. This is a graphic novel and you don't talk much about the art beyond saying that it is cartoony and that it provides emotional intensity – Your enthusiasm for the work shines through clearly and makes me want to know more. Could you talk about how the art conveys emotional meaning? Through line thickness or shading or color choices? And is it anime-style cartoony or CatDog style or would you describe it a different way?
- c. You are not required to provide a narrative response beyond this. Some peer reviewers like to do a narrative wrap-up, and sometimes it can be helpful to provide holistic comments directly to the editor, so the option is available to you. But that's not where we want you to focus your energy.

Notes on critique: Remember that you're working with another person who cares about disability representation, and cares about providing helpful reviews, but maybe they are new to doing this kind of work or they struggle to write sometimes due to brain fog or they have rejection sensitivity or.... Whatever the circumstance, providing encouragement as well as critique can be really valuable. "Great description of the emotional impact of the line art!" or "Really insightful point!" can be just as helpful for the reviewer as the critique is. It also helps the editors have a better understanding of the piece as a whole.

Article Reviews

Under construction - still being developed