

Peer Review Worksheet

Report author: \_\_\_\_\_

Experiment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

**1. Skim the report to get the gist of what it is about.**

In one paragraph, what did the authors do, what did they find?

**2. Read the report in detail. Make notes on the report itself with your ideas, thoughts, as well as specific comments regarding the criteria on the following page.**

**3. Skim report examining structure and format making specific suggestions to improve organization, figure or table quality, and correcting spelling, grammar, etc.**

**4. Supported conclusions?-** What were the overall conclusions? Are these clearly supported by the data presented?

**5. Is it ready for publication?**

Briefly address the overall quality of the writing, formatting, organization, and figure quality.

6. Score the following categories with a numeric value between 1 (poor) and 5 (fabulous).  
Check marks are adequate for category criteria that are present.

\_\_\_ The abstract is a short paragraph and contains all pertinent components:

- \_\_\_ Length of about 250 words
- \_\_\_ Background/ importance
- \_\_\_ Purpose
- \_\_\_ Methods
- \_\_\_ Results
- \_\_\_ Interpretations/ implications/ conclusions

\_\_\_ The Introduction contains:

- \_\_\_ Contains adequate and appropriate background information
- \_\_\_ Suggests one or more reasonable outcomes of the experiment
- \_\_\_ Suggests one or more methods that may be used to address question
- \_\_\_ Poses a clear science question
- \_\_\_ The science question clearly follows from introductory materials

\_\_\_ The Instrument section:

- \_\_\_ Contains an instrument diagram(s)
- \_\_\_ Explains how the instrument works in a detailed yet concise way

\_\_\_ The Methods contain all pertinent information needed to replicate the experiment.

- \_\_\_ Sample preparation
- \_\_\_ Calibration
- \_\_\_ Instrument parameters
- \_\_\_ Methods are organized in a logical flow consistent with Results section

\_\_\_ The Results

- \_\_\_ Only results are presented, no interpretation
- \_\_\_ Results are presented in the same order as the Methods section
- \_\_\_ Figures and Tables are numbered according to the order they appear in the text

\_\_\_ Figures and Tables are neatly and carefully constructed

- \_\_\_ Raw data not shown
- \_\_\_ All needed results are present and all results presented are needed
- \_\_\_ Estimates of error/ error bars are provided as needed

\_\_\_ The Discussion

- \_\_\_ Interpretations follow directly from the results
- \_\_\_ Unusual or unexpected results are given reasonable explanations
- \_\_\_ Likely sources of error are identified and explained in professional terms

\_\_\_ The Conclusion

- \_\_\_ Briefly states the conclusions of the experiment
- \_\_\_ Circles back to the ideas/hypothesis presented in the introduction
- \_\_\_ If results were not conclusive, potential fixes are proposed

Overall Quality

- \_\_\_ Spelling and grammar errors do not distract from the meaning of the text
- \_\_\_ Coherence of thought/ writing flows in a logical way
- \_\_\_ References in text and in bibliography are complete and formatted consistently
- \_\_\_ Passive voice is used, no or few I's
- \_\_\_ A professional tone is maintained throughout

**CHEM 314W: Analytical Instrumental Laboratory    Peer Review Author:**

7. **Positive feedback-** What aspects of the report facilitated effective communication of the data? You **MUST** say something nice, truthful, and thoughtful! This can include the way data is plotted in a figure, the way something is described, etc.

8. **Constructive feedback-** (2-3 sentences) How can the authors revise the report to make it more efficient and effective at communicating their points? These suggestions can be general or specific. But, if you say something needs improvement, you must suggest a way to fix it.

9. **Recommendation: Accept    Minor Revisions    Major Revisions    Reject**  
**Briefly justify your recommendation:**

**Response to Reviewers**

Briefly respond to the reviewers thanking them for specific or major suggestions and stating how you implemented their suggestions. Alternatively, explain why you did not incorporate the advice of the reviewers. You do not need to respond to each small edit, but I expect 1 paragraph at minimum. If you did not incorporate major reviewer suggestions, you must address those points.