

How Do I Provide Evidence That My Online Submission Was Peer Reviewed?


ERIC will include the peer-review flag on online submissions if authors provide proof of a valid peer-review process.



ERIC will add the peer-review flag to articles reviewed by either

- **blind review**—author and reviewer identities are unknown, OR
- **expert review**—author and reviewer identities may be known

Once you submit proof that one of these methods was used, ERIC will mark the record as peer reviewed.



In the [Online Submission Form](#), choose what type of peer review was used, and give either a URL or a description in the PDF showing the peer-review steps.

Peer Review (optional)

Non-grantee content may be marked as peer reviewed if evidence is provided that the material is from a peer-reviewed source. ERIC recognizes blind and expert peer-review processes as described in the ERIC Selection Policy. Internal, editorial reviews and dissertation reviews are not recognized by ERIC as an accepted type of peer review.

The peer-review process must be briefly explained on the front matter of the document and must match ERIC's accepted types (blind and expert). Alternatively, you may submit a URL to the publisher's page or to a PDF outlining the peer-review process. If neither is included, your submission will not be marked as peer reviewed.

What type of peer-review process was used on the material you are submitting?

Is there a brief statement or explanation of the peer-review process in the front matter of the document?

-- N/A --
 Blind (or anonymous) peer review
 Expert peer review

-- N/A --
 Yes
 No (provide link below)

URL to webpage or PDF



ERIC will accept as proof:

- A URL that goes to a webpage explaining the peer-review process, OR
- A description of the peer-review process on the submitted PDF



The following are not counted as proof:

- URL to a general website page or the submission itself
- PDF that includes only the name of a reviewer or statement that the work is peer reviewed
- Description of the research process, not of the peer-review process