



APT Bulletin: The Journal of Preservation Technology **Peer-Review Guidelines**

Revised April 2026

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 and to the success of *Practice Points* as a series of informational guides published within the *Bulletin*. Without the expertise of peer reviewers, the *APT Bulletin* and *Practice Points* would not be able to offer the consistently excellent information that our audience has come to expect.

The *Bulletin* editor contacts potential peer reviewers for **general article manuscripts** (full-length articles for the *Bulletin* other than *Practice Points*) and for ***Practice Points* manuscripts** (covered in separate peer-review guidelines). Once assigned, each manuscript and its accompanying images are emailed to two to three reviewers, who are given approximately three 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 for the peer reviewer to complete 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. The peer-review process is also confidential; peer reviewers may consult with a colleague about the review if necessary, but manuscripts should not be distributed. The *Bulletin* editor leads the peer-review process and may consult with guest editors and/or *Practice Points* editors to interpret or resolve conflicts between peer-review comments.

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. APT relies 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 *APT Bulletin* editor considers to have been previously published.

The peer-review process helps the *Bulletin* editor (and guest editors, if any) 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.

It is critical that reviewers provide impartial, unbiased reviews. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, potential reviewers are asked 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(s) being discussed. If a reviewer discovers after receiving a manuscript that the reviewer or his or her firm was involved in the project(s) discussed in the manuscript, the reviewer should disqualify himself or herself and notify the *Bulletin* editor 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.

Reviewers must not share manuscript content with others or upload it to AI tools for any purpose. Although it is permissible to use AI to refine the wording of reviews once written, reviewers must not use AI tools to generate reviews.

Criteria and Procedures for Peer Review

Reviewers are asked to consider the following criteria and procedures:

General

1. Is the manuscript worth publishing?
2. Does the manuscript conform to APT's "[Guidelines on What Constitutes Previously Published](#)"? Also, if you are aware of a previous publication of this material that is not acknowledged in the manuscript, please let us know.
3. Does the manuscript contain purely speculative material?
4. Is material included in the manuscript for commercial advantage?
5. Were sound preservation practices followed?
6. Does the manuscript contribute new knowledge to the field of preservation technology?
7. Technical manuscripts: Are the concepts in the manuscript original and sound?
8. Historical manuscripts: Are the concepts based on thorough research, including investigation of original source materials and a comprehensive knowledge of the subject?

Subject Treatment

1. Does the title clearly convey the subject of the manuscript?
2. Does the manuscript clearly state its objective?
3. Does the manuscript cover its stated objective?
4. Is the information accurate and consistent?
5. Is background information treated adequately?
6. Does the manuscript describe research or technical procedures clearly and in sufficient detail?
7. Is the subject closely related to preservation technology and APT's mission? APT's mission is to advance appropriate traditional and new technologies to care for, protect, and promote the longevity of the built environment and to cultivate the exchange of knowledge throughout the international community.
8. Is there sufficient evidence to support the author's thesis?

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? If, in the course of your review, you need access to unpublished reference material cited in the text in order to properly evaluate the manuscript, please contact the editor to determine whether a copy can be obtained.

Publication Recommendation

Please select a publication recommendation (rating) for the manuscript and explain your reasons for selecting this rating in the Review Comments section below. Only essential revisions should be considered when deciding upon a publication recommendation.

- **Accepted without revision.** This recommendation indicates that the manuscript is sound in principle and methodology and no essential revisions are necessary.
- **Accepted with minor revisions.** This recommendation indicates that the manuscript is mostly sound, but may require minor revisions to the argument, interpretations, or references.
- **Accepted with major revisions.** This recommendation indicates that the principle of the manuscript is sound, but major, essential revisions need to be made. These may include major restructuring of the text, addition of further evidence or data, consideration of an additional topic, or reconsideration of the validity of the results and analysis.
- **Rejected.** This recommendation indicates that the article is not sound in principle or methodology or that it does not represent a worthwhile contribution to the field of preservation technology. Please offer objective evidence in the explanation of your reasons for selecting this rating. If possible, please also indicate ways in which the authors could improve upon the work in the future.

Review Comments

1. **Please focus on the content of the manuscript rather than on issues of editorial style.** The *Bulletin* editorial staff will work closely with the authors during the copyediting process.
2. 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. Peer reviews should generally seek to support work in the field. To that end, your review should contain constructive criticism and suggestions for both major and minor revisions. Any unnecessarily harsh or unkind comments are not considered helpful and will not be shared with the author.
3. Please differentiate between non-essential suggested improvements and those that are essential for the success of the article.
4. Completion of the peer-review form is required; returning the Microsoft Word file of the manuscript is optional. As the peer-review form is the means of communicating review comments to authors, all recommended revisions should be synthesized into high-level comments on the form. Where it is necessary to refer to specific portions of the manuscript, cite page numbers in your comments on the peer-review form. If tracked changes are part of your review process, you are encouraged to share the marked-up manuscript with the *Bulletin* editor.

Given the difficulty of coordinating tracked changes from multiple reviewers, the decision of whether to share marked-up manuscripts with the authors (and at what point in the publication process) will be at the discretion of the *Bulletin* editor in consultation with guest editors and/or *Practice Points* editors. **All essential revisions must be summarized on the peer-review form.**

5. Be sure to indicate a publication recommendation on the review form.

Thank you for your time, efforts, and expertise.

Contact Information

Josie Madison, Interim Editor, *APT Bulletin*
bulletineditor@apti.org