



## ***Doody's Collection Development Monthly*** **Electronic Resource Review Update**

### **Description**

Each month, the Doody's Collection Development Monthly newsletter and website features an update to a published original review of an electronic resource written by a librarian. The review update aims to capture changes to the resource made since the original review was published and responds to any criticisms or suggestions made in the original review. To see published examples, visit <https://dcdm.doody.com/category/guest-article/>.

### **Specifications**

Review updates generally comply with the following specifications:

- Paragraph text written in full sentences that may include bulleted lists and hyperlinks and follows the guided template below.
- Written in an informational, rather than promotional, tone.
- Graphics, such as charts or screenshots, are welcome. (For screenshots of licensed resources, the Doody's team will collaborate on seeking permissions.)
- Review updates average 700 words but may range from 500 to 800 words.
- References or citations may be included in the format preferred by the reviewer.

Reviewers must not have a conflict of interest at all in updating the review of the resource. It is vital that all review updates objectively report on the resource while clearly providing the reviewer's opinion when called for. As these resources are dynamic, the review update should speak specifically to content, features, and functionalities that stand out or could be improved.

### **Submission Process**

Final drafts of review updates are due no later than three weeks prior to the anticipated publication date. Iterative drafts are welcome, but not required. Doody's staff will work directly with reviewers to complete developmental edits at the time of submission. Doody's staff will be responsible for copyediting and final publication formatting. At the time of submission, reviewers are asked to submit a headshot along with their preferred attribution (name, credentials, and institutional affiliation) as they'd like it to appear with the review update.

### **Publication Process**

Review updates are published on the fourth Tuesday of each month (except in December, when they are published on the third Tuesday) as a primary editorial component of the Doody's Collection Development Monthly newsletter. The review will also be a primary editorial piece on the homepage of the DCDM website, which is syndicated with the Doody's Review Service and Doody's Core Titles websites.

## **Guided Template**

Below is a structured template for each section of the review update. While the guiding questions are there to ensure the basics are covered, they are not meant to limit or restrict the overall content of the review. Going beyond these questions is encouraged to reflect the uniqueness of each resource.

### *Opening*

Please open the review with a sentence along the following lines: “This is an update of a review published in the mm/yy issue of Doody’s Collection Development Monthly. You can find the original review here (add URL to the original review.)”

### *Section 1: Introduction*

This section will comprise 3-4 sentences that answer the following questions:

- What resource is being reviewed again?
- Reiterate the publisher, the purpose of the resource, and its intended audience. It’s okay if much of this language similar to the original review.
- At a high level, what changes has the resource undergone since the original review? For example, new content or features have been added, new functionality has been created, etc.

### *Section 2: Content*

This section will comprise 1-2 paragraphs that answer the following questions:

- Recap the primary subject matter of the resource and the types of content available from the original review.
- What new content has been added since the original review? Describe it in detail and discuss the formats it takes and how it is accessed or delivered.
- Is the new content appropriate for the original intended audience, or does the new content expand the potential appeal to new audience(s)?
- It’s highly encouraged to consider including screenshots of salient content.

### *Section 3: Features/Functionality*

This section will comprise 1-2 paragraphs that answer the following questions:

- Briefly recap the resource’s basic layout, salient features, and search functionality.
- Which features and functionalities have been updated or added? Describe the changes in detail.
- What improvements have been made to the user experience?
- Has the resource been updated to address any of the improvements or drawbacks suggested in the original review?
- It’s highly encouraged to consider including screenshots of salient features or functionality.

### *Section 4: Business Model*

This section will comprise 4-6 sentences that answer the following questions:

- Briefly recap the business/licensing model for this resource, its subscription types, its access methods, etc.
- In what ways has the business model changed since the original review? It’s okay if it has remained largely the same.
- In what new ways can end users gain access to the resource?
- Has more content been made available Open Access?
- Have there been price increases since the original review? If so, do they seem justified?

### *Section 5: Breakthrough*

This section will comprise 3-4 sentences that answer the following questions:

- In brief, describe the continued value of the resource to the health information community. Note if the value has changed since the original review.
- Recap what type of end users will benefit most from the resource.
- What types of libraries would benefit most from the resource?
- Why should a library continue considering (or not considering) subscribing to this resource?