

BIOL 405 Evaluation Tool for Peer Reviews

Name of reviewer: _____

Name of reviewee: _____

Assign points using a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = poor and 5 = superior.)

1. Is the paper neat and well organized with easy to follow information? _____

2. Does the abstract clearly summarize the paper topic? _____

3. How would you rank the content and quality of the abstract? For example, is the big picture described? Are any central questions/hypotheses introduced? Are the primary points of the paper summarized? Is it an appropriate length (less than ~300 words)? _____

4. How would you rank the content and quality of the introduction? For example, does it introduce the overarching themes and topics of the paper? Does it provide enough background to prepare the reader for the remainder of the paper? Does it state the major questions/hypothesis within the topic being covered? _____

5. How would you rank the content and quality of the discussion and conclusions? For example, did the author present a clear synthesis of the findings from the literature? Did s/he address all hypotheses and questions stated in the introduction? Did s/he avoid detailed re-description of data? Did the writing reflect deep thinking and critical analysis of the literature? _____

6. How would you rank the overall scientific coverage of the topic? For example, did the paper present the current state of the chosen topic in a manner that is accurate, succinct, and comprehensive? _____

7. How would you rank the logical flow of the paper? For example, were facts, arguments, and hypothesis presented in a manner that seemed logical? Were all sub-topics within the paper clearly described with sufficient detail, or, if summarized succinctly, were they referenced well enough for you to further pursue the topic? _____

8. Was the ecological perspective described with sufficient detail? _____

9. Was the evolutionary perspective described with sufficient detail? _____

10. Were any relevant molecular mechanisms adequately described? _____

11. Do the visuals (including figures and tables) effectively enhance the presented information? Did the legends contain sufficient information to understand each graphic? _____

12. Were relevant literature citations integrated into the text and listed in an appropriate format at the end of the paper? For example, are all listed references cited to in the text, and vice versa? Are there at least 5 references to primary research articles (in *addition* to review articles and/or book chapters)? _____

13. How would you rank the overall writing style and mechanics? For example, was the paper overall clearly and concisely written? Was there appropriate use of headings and sub-headings? Did each paragraph contain a topic sentence? Were there smooth transitions between paragraphs? Was the progression of information logical and orderly? _____

Total points (max = 65 points) _____

If you found any aspect of the paper particularly well done, please state this and explain why.

If you found any aspect of the paper not-so-well done, please state this and explain why.

Describe three things that you enjoyed learning about microbial ecology, during your review of this paper.

Describe three things that you learning about scientific writing (or writing, in general), during your review of this paper.