Peer-review sheet used by students during the double-blind peer review.

Peer Review

Paper by: _____   Reviewed by: _____   _____
              ID Number   ID Number   ID Number

                                                _____   _____
                                                   ID Number   ID Number

Criteria	No	Needs improvement	Good	Excellent
Goals				
Did the author introduce the phenomenon under investigation and the problem to be solved?	____	____	____	____
Did the author make the research question or goals of the investigation clear and explicit?	____	____	____	____
Did the author explain why the work was done and why this work is useful or needed?	____	____	____	____
Explain why your group gave any "Needs improvement" or "No" marks in the space below:				
Investigation				
Did the author describe how he or she went about the work?	____	____	____	____
Did the author explain why the work was done in this way?	____	____	____	____
Did the author use appropriate terms to describe the nature of the investigation (e.g., *experiment, systematic observation,* or *interpretation of an existing data set*)?	____	____	____	____
Explain why your group gave any "Needs improvement" or "No" marks in the space below:				
Argument				
Did the author include a well-articulated explanation that provides a sufficient answer to the research question (i.e., does it explain everything that it should)?	____	____	____	____
Is the author's explanation coherent and free from contradictions?	____	____	____	____
Did the author use genuine evidence (trends over time, differences between groups, relationships between variables) to support the explanation?	____	____	____	____
Did the author present the evidence in an appropriate manner (e.g., correctly formatted diagrams, graphs, or tables)?	____	____	____	____
Does the author have enough evidence to support the explanation?	____	____	____	____

(The author supported all of his or her ideas and used more than one piece of evidence.)   _____   _____   _____   _____

Is the author's evidence valid (appropriate methods were used to gather the data) and reliable (the author attempted to reduce error in the measurements)?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Does the author's explanation fit with all the available evidence?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Is the author's reasoning sufficient (it explains why the evidence was used and why it supports the explanation) and appropriate (rational and sound)?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Is the author's explanation consistent with what the other groups found and what was discussed in class?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Did the author leave out inappropriate phrases (e.g., "it proves it," "it's right," "it's correct," "my proof is") and use key terms correctly (e.g., *hypothesis* or *prediction*)?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Explain why your group gave any "Needs improvement" or "No" marks in the space below:

Writing

Content: Did the author express his or her ideas clearly and provide the reader with valuable insight?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Organization: Does the writing have a sense of purpose and structure?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Voice: Does the reader get a sense that someone real is there on the page?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Word choice: Did the author choose just the right words to make the writing sound natural and precise?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Sentence fluency: Did the author create a sense of rhythm with the sentences and a flow that is enjoyable for the reader?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Conventions: Did the author use appropriate grammar, spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, and capitalization?   _____   _____   _____   _____

Explain why your group gave any "Needs improvement" or "No" marks in the space below:

Final decision: _____   Accept   _____   Revise and resubmit