

Peer Review Form for the Discussion:
EEES 6810/8810
review is worth 20 points

Reviewer name:

Title of manuscript:

Author(s):

Please indicate your overall assessment by checking the appropriate boxes:

Quality of the presentation

Excellent, no flaws

Good, no major flaws

Competent, but suffering
from serious flaws

Weak, major flaws or
inconsistencies

Adherence to the
instructions

Presented to the reviewer
in a timely manner

Appropriate length

Double spaced

Page/Line numbers

Font size (12 minimum)

General comments

Overall impression

Readability

Flow

Excess details omitted

Proper use of references

Proper use of headings

Etc.

Specific comments

Example: P. 2, L. 10. Reference information missing

Questions to address as you write the review:

Were the following questions answered? (5 points)

1. What did you expect to find, and why?
2. How did your results compare with those that were expected?
3. How might you explain any unexpected results?
4. How might you test these potential explanations?
5. Based on your results, what questions might you want to ask next?

Organization (5 points)

- Did the most important finding go first?
- Did the next most important finding go next?
- Is there a paragraph describing the potential limitations/improvements to the method and its role in future studies?
- Is there a concluding paragraph that (i) summarizes the findings, (ii) expresses the benefits of the research, and (iii) proposes future activity?

Clarity of information (5 points)

- Has information been presented with the audience (advisor, journal editor) in mind?
- Be sure to review assumptions about the reader being familiar (or not) with local issues, policies, or technical language.

Format (5 points)

- Is the terminology appropriate?
- Have abbreviations or acronyms been explained and are they clear?
- Are grammar, number use, and punctuation correct?