

Peer Review Questions

1. The background gives accurate, concise and relevant information that places the study in context.
2. The objectives for the study are clearly, concisely and accurately stated.
3. The methods used in the study are accurately and concisely described with a level of detail appropriate to a technical audience. Moreover, only those methods that directly lead to the results reported are described.
4. The important results of the study that lead logically to the conclusions are clearly and concisely reported using appropriate units where appropriate.
5. The abstract draws valid conclusions justified by the reported results in a way that is consistent with the stated objectives.
6. The abstract is free of mechanical (e.g. spelling, grammar, etc.) errors.
7. The abstract properly defines any non-standard abbreviations.
8. The abstract properly uses vocabulary that is appropriate for a technical audience.
9. The abstract is free of first person singular and second person pronouns.
10. The abstract is free of contractions.
11. The abstract follows the directions in the writing prompt.
12. What are three things this abstract does well?
13. What are three things that would make this abstract stronger?

Peer Review Grading Rubric

Recall that peer reviews count 20% of your final grade in VIBS 310. To clarify a common point of confusion, this grade is not based on how your peers grade your paper. Rather, this grade is based on the quality of feedback you give to your peers. Below is the rubric we use to evaluate each of your peer reviews:

Points	Criteria	Example
9-10	The review outlines in detail the strengths, weaknesses, mechanical errors, etc. of the paper and provides concrete guidance on how to improve it.	Good job. There were some grammatical errors and I have pointed them out in the paper. In addition, I think you might need to work on the results a little more. There is not enough numerical data. Also, there should be more detail about the experiment in your methods. For instance how many test groups were there? I like your introduction but it might be too vague. Maybe you can reword it to sound like...
7-8	The reviewer has outlined the strengths, weaknesses, mechanical errors, etc. of the paper, but has provided relatively little guidance on how to improve it.	Good job. There were some grammatical errors. In addition, I think you might need to work on the results a little more. The introduction could be shortened bit. Right now it is a little vague.
5-6	The reviewer has provided only general comments that lack specificity.	There were some grammatical errors. I really thought the paper was clear but I think you need to work on your results a little more.
4	The reviewer has provided very little feedback on the paper apart from assigning scores on the questionnaire.	Good job! I really thought the paper was clear.

Your final grade for each peer review assignment will be the average of the peer reviews you were assigned.