

PEER REVIEW ASSIGNMENT

Your peer reviews will be divided into five sections and must be at least one single-spaced page. For each review, plan to spend at least an hour. Frequently, it takes 3 hours or more. This includes the time it takes you to read the draft, think about your comments, and write your review. If you are not spending at least an hour with the text, you may not be considering it fully enough and this may be reflected in your grade.

1. Short summary of paper in your own words:

- a. In a paragraph, reword for the author what you perceived to be their main purpose and the take home messages of the synthesis.

2. Overall content (often it is best to write this section last)

- a. Provide the writer the big picture on the main strengths and weaknesses of the paper focusing on both the scientific rigor and the quality of the writing.

3. Clarity of presentation and quality of writing:

- a. Evaluate the conciseness and syntax, clarity of paragraph structure, and logical flow of argument. How long did it take you to realize the main point of the paper? Are you sure you know what it is? Did the rest of the information in the paper support that main purpose?
- b. Identify recurring problems with the writing and suggest solutions for improvement.
- c. Prioritize your comments so the writer knows what the most important issues are to focus on.

4. Scientific engagement with content

- a. Make suggestions for improving the content of the paper with respect to the trait investigated and the study system.
- b. Comment on the strength of their argument and the adequacy of the supporting evidence. Are citations missing? Would particular experiments support their points better?
- c. Suggest alternative approaches or hypothesis to explain the observed patterns.

5. Other specific/detailed comments (not evaluated)

- a. Detailed comments on particular paragraphs, sentences, or concerning wording. You may find it easiest to provide these comments via track changes in Word.

RUBRIC FOR PEER REVIEWS

Your peer reviews will be divided into five sections, as described in the “Rubric for evaluating papers.” Your review will be evaluated according to your commentary under each category. The categories, and criteria for evaluation of the peer review, include:

1. Short summary of paper in your own words: (20%)

- a. Did you demonstrate for the author what you perceived to be their main purpose?

2. Overall content: (20%)

- a. Did you organize and summarize the main strengths and weaknesses of the project?
- b. Did you address the scientific content and the overall quality of the paper?

3. Clarity of presentation and quality of writing: (20%)

- a. Would your suggestions improve the writing and organization?
- b. Did you identify useful patterns in the writing and suggest solutions for improvement?
- c. Did you prioritize your comments?

4. Scientific engagement with content of reader: (20%)

- a. Did you make useful suggestions for improving the content of the paper, with respect to the trait investigated and the study system?
- b. Did you *engage the scientific argument* adequately to provide useful commentary on the strength of their argument and the adequacy of the supporting evidence?
- c. Did you *engage the scientific argument* adequately to suggest alternative approaches or hypothesis to explain the observed patterns?

5. Tone: (20%)

- a. Did you present your review in a thoughtful, respectful, and considerate way? Did you avoid judging the person and instead evaluate the work? Did you provide concrete, productive suggestions about how to improve their writing? Did you comment on the things they did well as well as the things that need to be improved?

*****Other comments section is not evaluated*****

Name:	
1. Short summary of paper in your own words:	/20
a. Did you demonstrate for the author what you perceived to be their main purpose? YES-	
2. Overall content:	/20
a. Did you organize and summarize the main strengths and weaknesses of the project? YES	
b. Did you address the scientific content and the overall quality of the paper? YES	
3. Clarity of presentation and quality of writing:	/20
a. Would your suggestions improve the writing and organization? YES	
b. Did you identify useful patterns in the writing and suggest solutions for improvement? YES	
c. Did you prioritize your comments? YES	
4. Scientific engagement with content	/20
a. Did you make useful suggestions for improving the content of the paper, with respect to the trait investigated and the study system? YES	
b. Did you <i>engage the scientific argument</i> adequately to provide useful commentary on the strength of their argument and the adequacy of the supporting evidence? YES	
c. Did you <i>engage the scientific argument</i> adequately to suggest alternative approaches or hypothesis to explain the observed patterns? YES	
5. Tone:	/20
a. Did you present your review in a respectful, concrete, and balanced way? YES	
Total:	/100