
Paper title

Date

Writer's name

Reviewer's name

Instructions for Peer Review & Revision of Project

Monday 1/23/12 — Draft due in class: Exchange papers. Use this form to guide your review of a classmate's paper. Respond to the questions below and also write comments on the draft itself.

Wednesday 1/25/12 — Return draft & this comment sheet to the writer. NOTE: When revising your paper, you should carefully consider the peer comments (although you do not need to make all of the recommended changes).

Monday 2/06/12— Revised paper due by 1pm before class, via email, or turned in to Danielle Bower's mailbox (first floor of Beckman Institute). You must also turn in (1) your first draft, (2) this review sheet, and (3) a brief description (1-3 paragraphs) of the major changes you made between drafts and your response to the peer review (comments you found useful, comments you may have disregarded & why).

Reviewers: Evaluate the draft according to each objective, below. Comments should include compliments, criticisms and suggestions, as appropriate. Consider possible improvements to evidence, logic, or analysis and note if any information is extraneous.

How effectively does the paper . . .

1. Set the stage (≤ 1 page): Intro, background
Introduce topic & importance
Explain what researchers want to find out
Describe approach (briefly)

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

2. Discuss Technology (~2 pages): Most important topic
Describe procedures: Experiments, methods of analyzing data
Explain microscopy: Type of scope, how it works, advantages/disadvantages

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

3. Present the Findings (≤ 1 page): (accurate summary of the paper's results)

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

4. Recommend improvements, focusing on microscopy (~1-2 pages)

Experiments: To what extent do the experiments address the question or problem? How, if at all, could they be improved?

Analysis: How, if at all, could researchers improve the data analysis? If no changes are necessary, why?

Future directions: What other procedures, if any, would make the paper more complete?

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

4. Recommend improvements, focusing on microscopy (~1-2 pages)

Experiments: To what extent do the experiments address the question or problem? How, if at all, could they be improved?

Analysis: How, if at all, could researchers improve the data analysis? If no changes are necessary, why?

Future directions: What other procedures, if any, would make the paper more complete?

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

5. Include references to relevant research (support your analysis & recommendations)

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

Other issues. . .

6. Organization

Note on the paper where sentences or paragraphs seem out of order and suggest how they could be rearranged more logically (use comments, arrows, numbers, etc.).

Add any transitions, headings or other cues that would make the organization smoother.

7. Clarity

Draw a circle around the clearest sentence.

Draw a wavy line under the most confusing sentence.

8. **Proofreading:** Mark on the paper any suggested changes in phrasing, syntax, grammar, punctuation, or spelling.

What is your **overall impression** of this paper and why? Circle a rating below & explain:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
deficient, poorly expressed <-----> brilliant analysis, excellent writing

Explain your rating:

Other comments and suggestions: