**Peer Reviewer’s Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Paper Writer’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Spend time carefully reading the paper before you respond to the following items.**

1. Talk to the paper writer about any concerns s/he may have about the paper. Read through the paper fairly quickly to get a sense of the whole thing. Read primarily to see if you can follow the argument; do you have questions as you are reading?

2. Underline passages or sentences or even terms that aren’t clear to you. Write in specific questions when you think of them. Do you want to know more? Would you like to see specific examples? Circle obvious mistakes but don’t stop to correct them. Put a check mark or exclamation point next to things your think are really effectively expressed or good points.

3. Now go back through the paper carefully paying attention to the following specific issues:

1. **Introduction:**

Ø      Does the opening paragraph clearly set the context for what the paper is about?

Ø      Does it establish an arguable, compelling, sophisticated thesis?

Ø      Does it pose a “problem” that the writer will research?

Ø      Is the problem too vague or too general?

Ø      Does it suggest “so what” or some sense of the significance or relevance of this topic?

 2. **Tone**:

Ø      Is the tone appropriate for a research paper? The writer’s position can be clear, but it should not be “emotional” or read like an editorial.

3. **Argument:**

Ø      Are you persuaded by the argument?

Ø      Does the writer need to provide more evidence? If so, where?

Ø      Is there enough analysis of the evidence?

4. **Quotations:**

Ø      Are they used to support or illuminate arguments? Are they too long?

Ø      Is it clear when the writer is summarizing someone else and when s/he is using his/her own ideas?

Ø      Has the writer provided documentation?

Ø      Has the writer explained why they are significant?

Ø      Has the writer interpreted them?

 5. **Organization:**

Ø      Does the development of the argument flow smoothly?

Ø      Can you follow the logical transitions?

Ø      Would you change the order?

Ø      Would you make clearer transitions?

6. **Development:**

Ø      Can you think of pieces of the argument that might be missing?

Ø      Are there areas you could add that would add more complexity?

Ø      What would someone who disagrees with your ideas say? Have you anticipated their questions?

7. **Conclusions:**

Ø      Does the writer tell us “so what”?

Ø      Does the writer suggest the implications of her/his argument?

Ø      Does the writer do more than restate the points of her/his argument?

**Suggestions for Self-Revision**:

\*\* Read your paper out loud (this works especially well if you actually read it to someone). Listen to the paper the way someone else might hear it. Underline passages or sentences that you pause or stumble over as you read them out loud. Go back to these passages later.

\*\*Proofread for only one kind of error at a time. For example, proof read for spelling in a separate step than proofreading for punctuation or than proofreading for coherent flow of ideas.