**Peer Review of Research Paper**

 Use the rubric below to do an in-depth review of your peer’s proposal. See additional instructions on form below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **Title & Authors** | Absent | Title is lengthy and unclear | Title is lengthy, but clear | Title is concise and clear |
| **Background/****Rationale** | Absent | The background information presented lacks the content needed to understand the scientific reasoning behind the hypothesis or research question. | The relevant background information is presented, but poorly organized. Therefore, the reasoning behind the hypothesis or research question does not follow logically from it.  | The relevant background information is presented is organized such that the reasoning behind the hypothesis or research question follows logically from it. |
| **Hypothesis or Research Question** | Absent | A statement is made, but it is neither a hypothesis, nor a research question. Variables being studied are not clear. | A hypothesis or research question statement is made, but it is neither concise nor follows logically from the background information. Or it is unclear what the independent and dependent variables are. | A clear and concise statement of the hypothesis or research question is made that follows logically from the background information. If the project is experimental, the independent and dependent variables are clear. |
| **Relevance and Implications** | Absent | The relevance and/or implications of the research is stated, but is very general and does not specifically point out how the research will fill a gap in basic research, ecology, or conservation knowledge. | The relevance and implications of the research is stated, with at least one knowledge gap in basic research, ecology, or conservation identified, but the exploration of the topic is incomplete or unspecific. | The stated relevance and implications of the research thoroughly explores specific gaps in basic research, ecology, or conservation that the research will fill. |
| **Experimental/ Project Design** | Absent | Experiments are listed but lack detail and are not connected to the stated hypothesis or research question. | Experiments are listed, and either well explained or connected to the stated hypothesis or research question, but not both. | Experiments are listed, well explained, and connected to the stated hypothesis or research question. |
| **Results** | Absent | Key results are not described, or are lacking descriptive statistics and appropriate tables and/or figures to represent them. Or description of results are incomplete or do not link directly to hypotheses tested.  | Key results are described with descriptive statistics, or a table and/or figure is given to represent them but not both. Or results are incomplete or are not clearly linked to the hypotheses being tested. | Results are clearly described with descriptive statistics with appropriate tables and/or figures. Results are complete, and clearly link to hypotheses being tested. |
| **Figures/Tables** | Absent | Figures or tables do not display the appropriate information. Formatting elements may need work. | Figures or tables display appropriate information, but need work on formatting elements (axis labels, captions, error bars, etc.)  | Figures or tables display appropriate information, and include all formatting elements (axis labels, captions, error bars, etc.) |
| **Discussion** | Absent | Discussion does not link the results back to background and hypotheses given in the introduction nor comment on the broader relevance of the project. Many statements are unsubstantiated or irrelevant | Discussion either links the results back to background and hypothesis given in the Intro, or discusses the broader relevance but not both. Some statements may be irrelevant or unsubstantiated. | Discussion links the results back to the background and hypotheses given in the Intro. The broader relevance of the project is discussed. Statements are relevant to the topic and substantiated with new citations. |
| **Literature Cited** | Absent  | Literature cited does not include all the references cited in the text or vice versa, AND some or all citations not in the correct format. | Literature cited includes all the references cited in the text and vice versa, OR some in the list or in the text are not in the correct format. | Literature cited includes all the references cited in the text. and all references lited in literature cited are present in the text. Citations are formatted correctly. |
| **Writing** | Absent | Many sentences are unclear, choppy, or need condensing. Grammar and spelling errors present. | Mostly clear, concise sentences. Some work needed on clarity and flow. Some grammatical or spelling errors. | Clear and concise. Text flows logically. No grammatical or spelling errors. |
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First, read the proposal carefully and make edits or comments directly on the proposal document. Then, based on your comments, evaluate each component according to the rubric guidelines above. Offer ***specific*** suggestions for how to improve the components.

Give this form back to your instructor together with the proposal with your comments (either hardcopy or electronic is fine).
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Comment on any other aspects of the proposal, or specific ideas or sections that need work or that are especially good.