1. Yourself and your web browser

Sometimes websites behave differently according to the web browser being used. Please tell us the exact browser and version that you have used in preparing this review (e.g. Internet Explorer (I.E) 6.0 or IE 7.0, Mozilla Firefox etc). This can be found in most browsers by clicking on the "Help" tab and selecting the "About"… option. In the case of Firefox, Flocks, Opera, simply put "Firefox", "Flocks", "Opera" as appropriate.

Name of reviewer:	
Resource being reviewed:	
Please identify your browser software and version:	
Have you ever used this online resource before as part of your academic work?	Yes/no

2. Standardization of layout

Is the **layout**/**navigation** consistent throughout the site?	Yes/no
Remedial work required? (please comment)	
Would you recommend any **major** changes or improvements to the current layout? **(**please comment**)**	

3. Broken links

We will run automated link-checking software on this site to identify any broken links. We do not therefore need you to duplicate this task. However, if you come across an important broken link (for example a link to a major website external to the resource under review) and from your expert knowledge of the subject area, you are able to tell us the correct link or an appropriate alternative, it would be helpful if you would tell us. You do not need to record here any broken links within the current website as we will handle these automatically.

Page in this site containing **broken link** (either the URL or page title)	Description of broken link (either the URL or the text describing the link)	Suggested alternative or correction

4. Reference to external sites and software tools (*please comment if applicable*)

Are the **external sites and software tools** etc. **correctly and appropriately described** and used? Please tell us about any external links that require user registration or payment. (*For example, a software tool may not be appropriate because it is outdated or an external site may be unhelpful due to its contents or research findings; a site may only be accessible to subscribed members*).	Yes/no – please comment on any significant errors or weaknesses

5. Site content and management (*comment if applicable*)

Does the starting page adequately describe the **purpose, scope and beneficiaries** of the resource?	Yes/no
Would you suggest any **amendments** to the stated purpose, scope and beneficiaries?	

Is it possible to **access materials of interest without too many clicks and links**? (*For example, did you find that you had to follow many different links in order to navigate to another part of the site?*)	Yes/no
Please identify any (good or bad) examples of the above	

Are the contents **relevant and sufficient** to meet the stated aims of the site?	Yes/no
Please comment (include specific URLs where appropriate)	

Is the **academic content** of the site consistently of **high quality?** (*For example, would this be a reliable resource for young researchers to use without further guidance?*)	Yes/no
Please comment (include specific URLs where appropriate)	

Are there areas in which the site content has become **out of date**? *(For example, reference to news, prices, 'current developments' etc. that are no longer reliable or meaningful. Alternatively, research methods that are no longer considered to be best practice.* **You do not need to tell us about broken links in this question**)	Yes/no
Page in this site which has out of date content (either the URL or page title)	Any suggestions for update/improvement

Is the **writing** (grammar, typography etc.) on the site itself consistently of **high quality**? *(If there are just a few instances, please identify them. If the problems are widespread, you do not need to tell us about them all!)*	Yes/no
Page in this site which is poorly written (either the URL or page title)	Any suggestions for correction/improvement

Does the site make **appropriate reference to academic literature and external resources**? Is there appropriate direction for further reading/information?	Yes/no
Are there any glaring **omissions of external sites and software tools** etc. which you would have expected to see linked from this resource? *(For example there may be a major new tool relevant to this area which is not included)*	Yes/no – please identify any major omissions
Are there any glaring **omissions of academic literature** which you would have expected to see referenced from this resource? *(For example there may be a major new paper or textbook published since the site was authored)*	Yes/no – please identify any major omissions

Is there **superfluous material** that could be removed without detriment?	Yes/no
Page from which content could be removed (either the URL or page title)	

Are **graphics, video, sound, presentations** etc. necessary, appropriate and of sufficient quality?	Yes/no
Please comment (include specific URLs where appropriate)	

6. Brief Summary of site

Now that you have explored this site we would like you to consider how you would summarise its contents and purpose and to think whom it might benefit

Could you please briefly **describe in your own words** the purpose and contents of the site as you would describe it to a colleague?
Please tell us for which categories of researcher user this site would be useful *(For example, postgrads, research assistants, junior academic staff, senior academic staff, others…)*

What would be your **specific recommendation** about this online resource? (please choose **one** option from the following)	
Accept it as it is?	
Undertake essential updating/bug fixes before acceptance?	
Accept only after major revisions to content?	
Not suitable for acceptance	

7. Comments to ReStore team

Do you have any further specific comments for the ReStore team or editorial group?

8. Comments to resource author

Do you have any further specific comments for the attention of the original site authors? *(An author is somebody who has created the resource site in the first place and who may be invited to undertake revisions or updates)*