

PEER EDIT - IWA

AUTHOR: _____ REVIEWER: _____

STEP 1: Throughout the paper, correct for GRAMMAR, SPELLING, and AWKWARD phrasing

STEP 2: Review the REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY/WORKS CONSULTED/CITED page. Check the boxes if it is complete:

- Is it alphabetized?
- Is it formatted correctly with hanging indents?
- Do web sources also include full citations?
- Is it clear there are scholarly journals?
- Do you see a minimum of one stimulus source?
- Are a range of sources used? How many different TYPES of sources: _____
- CIRCLE anything that is wrong or needs to be fixed.

Keep the reference list available as you move through the paper. Confirm that each citation in the paper show up in the works cited.

- Does it? If not, what is missing: _____

STEP 3: ONCE UPON A TIME...How is the hook?

- Is it compelling? If not, WHY?

STEP 4: READ THE INTRODUCTION:

- Is the connecting theme clear? What do you think it is?: _____
- Do you see the research question explicitly stated?
- Is it posed in question form, with a question mark?
 - Does the research question pose a debatable question? If not, discuss why:

- CONTEXT: Is it clear WHY the research questions MATTERS? If not, discuss why or offer suggestions. The context should address to following:
 - WHAT is the issue (narrowed and focused)?
 - WHO are the major stakeholders? WHO is affected?
 - WHEN did this problem/issue begin? (time)
 - WHERE is it an issue?
 - WHY is it important?

STEP 5: READ THE BODY OF THE PAPER:

- After reading the body of the paper, list the POINTS OF VIEW or PERSPECTIVES (voices) that are included:

- Are these perspectives talking to one another? Can you identify the author's commentary where (s)he compares the multiple points of view and puts them in conversation with one another? (i.e., "agree", "disagree", "in contrast", "similarly", "opposes", etc.)
 - Is this practice consistently applied throughout the paper? If not, discuss where it is missing:

- Is there specific EVIDENCE offered to back up CLAIMS? This can include data, testimony, expert opinion, scholarly sources, etc. Please highlight and label "unsubstantiated claims"

- Is there COMMENTARY attached to the EVIDENCE that EXPLAINS **HOW** the evidence SUPPORTS the claims? Please highlight and label "missing commentary"

- Is the paper logically organized?
 - Is there effective use of SIGNPOSTS or SECTION HEADERS? Note any concerns:

STEP 6: READ THE END OF THE PAPER:

- Is there an IDENTIFIABLE conclusion, resolution, or solution offered?
- Does this solution ADDRESS the research question? Go back and read it to make sure.
- Is EVIDENCE introduced that explains whether the C/R/S is PLAUSIBLE? Will it work?

STEP 7: LOOKING BACK AT THE ENTIRE PAPER:

- Is there an EVALUATION of the POV or PERSPECTIVES?
 - This can take the form of considering the LIMITATIONS or IMPLICATIONS of a certain perspective or QUESTIONING a perspective or pov.
- Is this evaluation present in the body of the paper as well as the conclusion?