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YOUR JOB AS A PEER REVIEWER
The goal of peer review is to improve your classmates’ writing effort. You must read the paper that you are peer reviewing and provide a review of it. This component is completed individually be each team member. This does not require a huge time commitment, but can drastically improve the final paper.

I find it best to read a paper at least twice: first, to get a feel for the overall flow and structure (a macro read), and then another time for making typographical, grammatical, and finer-scale corrections and suggestions (a micro read). For the micro read, corrections to and/or comments on the writing should be made electronically in the text of the paper via “track changes and comments” feature of Microsoft Word or similar feature in another word processor.

For the macro read, you should answer the questions below, which are the same as the grading criteria used for the final version of the paper. It is generally easiest to paste this list below the text of the paper and answer them within the same file.

1) Is the research question and thesis statement/paragraph obvious, clearly stated, and within the first few paragraphs of the paper? Is it worth developing? How can it be improved?

2) Is the research approach clearly specified? Does it substantially inform the research methods and the way in which arguments are made? If not, how can it be improved?

3) Is there a logical progression of ideas that lend support to the authors’ argument? If not, how can the organization or reasoning be improved? Have the authors considered and provided evidence against arguments and interpretations that run contrary to their thesis?

4) What lines of argumentation and reasoning are weak, and which are strong and convincing? How can weak ones be improved?

5) Are the concepts and terms used properly defined and specified? If not, where is attention needed to reduce confusion?

6) Are there substantial connections made to materials discussed in, and read about for, class? If few or weak, how can these connections be increased and/or strengthened?

7) Does the structure of the sections and paragraphs make sense, with a topic sentence at the beginning of each paragraph followed by thoughts or data to support/expand upon the topic sentence? Are there specific paragraphs and/or sections that need work?
8) Do the authors use and critically evaluate a primary source of data and at least 10 secondary, peer-reviewed academic sources as required?

9) Do the authors use correct in-text citations and reference format (all resources in alphabetical order by author last name)? Do the authors cite the source for all information that needs to be cited?

10) Do the authors use proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation?

**SUGGESTIONS FOR WRITERS IN RESPONSE TO REVIEWS**
Writing and rewriting is the key to producing a good paper. Struggling with creating good macro and micro structure and good sentences may be difficult, but it pays off in the end by producing a product that more clearly communicates to the reader. Take time to read, ponder, and implement the suggestions provided by your peer reviewers. They provide a fresh perspective and can greatly strengthen the final report. Be sure to also thank your peer for their suggestions.

**DUE DATES & GRADE**
Your peer review comments, corrections, and answers to the above questions are due on Mar. 9 before class on SmartSite. I will then distribute the reviews to the correct team. PLEASE NOTE: they will not be accepted late because the team will need the most time possible to consider your comments.

It is worth 2% of your total course grade and is graded as done/not done.