Peer Review Workshop: Reviewer Worksheet

**Writer’s Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Write your name in the “Reviewer’s Name” space above. Write your partner’s name in the “Writer’s Name” space. You will use this sheet to record your thoughts on your partner’s paper and hand it back to them at the end of this Peer Review Workshop. Before exchanging papers with your partner, divide up your own paper by drawing a line under your introduction and a line above your conclusion. Doing so will give your partner three discrete sections to work on: Introduction, Body, and Conclusion. Now, exchange papers with your partner. ***Read your partner’s paper carefully.*** As you do so, keep in mind the discussion you just had with the UWC presenter, and follow the instructions below. These instructions will prompt you to locate and think carefully about certain elements of your partner’s paper. You will be asked to provide feedback both on the paper itself and on this worksheet. If you are honest and thoughtful, you will help your partner revise their paper.

1. What is the research question, partition, or thesis of this paper? Highlight it in the paper and copy it below in quotations (“ ”). If you cannot tell where/what the thesis is, note that.
2. Now, try to write the research question, partition, or thesis in your own words. If it is clear, you should be able to paraphrase it in a sentence that sounds as basic as, “This paper will argue A and B,” or “This paper will explore X, Y, and Z,” or “This paper will answer question .” etc.
3. What are the main claims of this paper? Write them in the margins of the paper next to where you read them. Ideally, there should be one main claim next to each paragraph. In the space below, write an example of a clear main claim from the paper. If you can’t tell what a paragraph’s main claim is, note that in the margins of the paper.
4. Does each main claim have evidence to support it? Highlight those sentences that share evidence. Does each bit of evidence clearly support its respective claim? If not, note this lack of correspondence in the margins of the paper. Pick an example of evidence that clearly supports a main claim. In the space below, copy that claim and 2-3 sentences of its evidence below.
5. Does all evidence have analysis attached to it? Highlight those sentences that perform analysis. In each paragraph, does the analysis explain how the evidence supports the main claim? If not, note this lack of correspondence in the margins of the paper. Pick an example of successful analysis and copy 2-3 sentences of it below.
6. Consider the body paragraphs as a whole: do the main claims answer the research question, follow the partition, or support the thesis without going outside of it? If they do not, describe this lack of correspondence in 3-4 sentences below, and propose a solution. For instance, does the partition need to be expanded or adjusted to match the main claims, or do the main claims need to be adjusted to match the partition?
7. Does the conclusion summarize/synthesize the paper’s main claims? Highlight those sentences where it does so. Does this part of the conclusion match the thesis articulated in the introduction? If not, note this lack of correspondence in the margins of the paper.
8. Does this conclusion answer the “So what?” question? Highlight the sentences in which it does so. Below, write in 1-2 complete sentences why the paper is relevant, important, or useful.