Peer Reviewing Lab Reports

Steps For Peer Review

1. Bring 2 PRINTED copies of the report to give your reviewers.
2. Exchange copies with two other students as directed by your GTA.
3. Skim the entire report quickly before going to work.
4. Read the list of grading criteria in the worksheet. These are points to focus on **first**. Most of them can be scored as YES/Present, or NO/Absent.
5. Re-read the report, this time looking for each of the **Five Basic Criteria**. If one of them is missing, mark that in the worksheet.
6. Next check the report for **technical and writing quality flaws**. If one of the listed flaws is present, circle it on the original report, and check that item in the worksheet. Include notes so you can explain what you found to the author.
7. Finally, look back over the entire report one last time**.** What are the 2-3 most important changes the author needs to make to improve their report?
8. Return the report with your comments to its author.
9. Let the author read your comments, then talk through each item so they understand exactly what your comments mean, and how you think they can improve.
10. After you finish (and if your GTA asks you to), turn in a copy of your review.

Review Criteria & Form

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Report Author’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Basic Criteria:**  If ANY of these 5 items is missing, a report is ***Unacceptable*** | Does Report Meet Criteria? | Notes, Comments, Suggestions to Improve This Item |
| **Lab report contain a hypothesis,** clearly articulated research goals. | Yes No |  |
| **Lab report is clearly organized.** Each section reflects structure of a scientific paper. For example, Results section does not contain interpretation. | Yes No |  |
| **Data figures, tables are clear and informative.** | Yes No |  |
| **Report has an interpretation of results.** Discussion states if hypothesis is supported and why. | Yes No |  |
| **Primary literature used to back up statements in Introduction, Discussion.** Supporting literature may be used in other sections too. | Yes No |  |
| **Flaws in Technical Criteria** | Does Report Meet Criteria? | What Could Author  Correct or Do to Improve? |
| Report contains raw data | Yes No |  |
| There are several errors in data summaries (graphs, tables) | Yes No |  |
| Improperly applied statistics | Yes No |  |
| Claims not supported by evidence provided or sources cited | Yes No |  |
| Connection between claims, evidence, reasoning is unclear | Yes No |  |
| Citation errors or misuse | Yes No |  |
| No references to figures, tables | Yes No |  |
| **Flaws in Writing Quality, Style** | Does Report Meet Criteria? | What Could Author  Correct or Do to Improve? |
| Unclear wording | Yes No |  |
| Poor flow | Yes No |  |
| Lacks clear thought process, plan connecting parts | Yes No |  |
| Imprecise language | Yes No |  |
| Wordy, not concise | Yes No |  |
| Not technically presented; “emotional” language | Yes No |  |
| Distracting elements detract from clearly understanding outcomes. | Yes No |  |

**Final Comments**

Considering the entire report overall, what are the 2-3 most important changes the author needs to make to improve their report?