

2nd Half of Paper Peer Review Questions and Prompts

Use these prompts and questions as a categorical guide of major topics and sections in the paper in which you can give feedback to the papers you peer review in your project group and/or papers you've been assigned.

To leave notes, click on the paper you select inside of turnitin.com in the peer review and give specific comments and feedback. The more specific your typed comments, the more likely it is to have value. *Depending on the technology, you might even be able to leave a summative voice comment at the end as a way to supplement your specific comments.*

At the end of the review, don't forget to give them "metric" feedback on the bold questions at the end of the document.

NOTE: As a general rule of thumb, provide feedback on both things that are working AND things that "need development" and/or attention.

And finally, don't forget about the rubric: [Final Paper Rubric](#)

- A typical problem with the Methods and Materials section is lack of specificity. The point is that somebody would be able to read this section and recreate your work and test your findings. After reading this section of the paper, comment on the clarity of the procedural steps and specificity of the required materials. Look for the following:
 - There should be no bullet point/numbered listings.
 - It should be done in narrative prose.
 - Use active voice/active verbs to describe their work and process. For example:
 - The hypothesis has been tested by the biology students at Camas High School. (passive)
 - The Camas High School biology students tested the hypothesis. (active)
 - Use past tense, describing your methods as if you were telling a story, in chronological order.
 - Include units (for measurements) used.
 - Include specific type of equipment used, except for typical lab equipment. For example, you do not need to write, "Placed 400 mL of HCl in the 500 mL Pyrex beaker." Instead, you would write, "Placed 400 mL of HCl in a 500 mL beaker."
 - If you have a particularly lengthy materials and methods section, it is appropriate to use subheadings (APA heading level-3), such as "temperature treatments," "pH treatments," and so on.
 - Include what statistical analysis method you will use and how that method fits your data set. Generally explain your process in chronological order.
- In terms of general organization of the M&M section, did they do the following?
 - Introductory paragraph that includes an overview of the topic and a well thought-out hypothesis or objective of the experiment.
 - Specific materials used (manufacturer and model)
 - Subjects (make sure to include the genus and species of any organism used)
 - Design (independent and dependent variables, control...)
 - Procedure (include the what, how, and why you chose to do what you did)
 - Statistical analysis
- Review the "Reference" page for formatting.
 - It should be titled as such, alphabetized, indented properly (hanging indentation), and make use of shortened "Retrieved from" web addresses (main domain name is all that's really needed).
 - No numbering or bullet points.
 - If there are multi author sources, are they following the guidelines for giving credit for both or all appropriately?
 - Do they demonstrate good breadth and depth of resources, including different types of sources?
- What about the general attention to APA formatting?
 - How did they do with the title page, running head, in-text parenthetical citations, etc.?
 - Look back through the paper and make a constructive evaluation, citing specific examples when possible.
- Scaled Metric Feedback, 1 low, 5 is high
 - How would you rate their use of "voice" in the M&M section? Did they use the active voice instead of passive?
 - How would you rate their general organization of the M&M section?
 - How would you rate their Discussion? Did they state whether hypothesis was supported and/or question/problem was supported solved or not?
 - How would you rate the connecting of their work to stuff discussed in Lit. Review?
 - How would you rate their evaluation of methodology? Did they fearlessly address problems/gaps in methodology in more than a superficial way?
 - How would you rate their plans for future experimentation and refinements in possible future trials?
 - How would you rate their formatting of the References page?
 - How would you rate their command of grammar and mechanics?
 - How would you rate their overall command of APA formatting?
 - How would you rate the overall, holistic strength of this paper?