

# PEER REVIEW

Mondays & Wednesdays | 12:30pm-1:45pm EDT | Georgetown University

## FAQs

### How long should it be?

Minimum 1 page per proposal you were assigned to read.

### I am in the asynchronous track. Do I have to present?

Yes, you will send us a video of you presenting your summary. This needs to be submitted by 9am EDT of the class day we will be having a peer review (last day of class before Thanksgiving break).

### What is the difference between primary vs secondary reviewer?

You submit a review paper for both proposal. The only difference is that the Primary reviewers "present" their assigned primary proposal to the rest of the class.

### I just found out that I won't be able to be online the day I sign up for but I don't want to record my presentation, what should I do?

If you can convince someone to switch then I am fine (use slack to do so if needed). Otherwise you are expected to submit a video or you will loose points.



Photo by Lukas from Pexels

## Guidelines

Peer reviewers are the gate-keepers of science.

When you write a paper or a grant proposal, it gets sent to fellow scientists (peers). They explain to you all the things you did wrong. If you can fix those things, your paper gets published (it becomes *canon*), or the grant gets funded (you get *money*). Clearly, the quality of science as a society-level endeavor depends on its peer reviewers; you will be assuming this role for your fellow classmates.

After the first draft of your proposals are due, I will give you two proposals; you are to serve as the **primary** on one of these and as the **secondary reviewer** on the other.

You will write a brief evaluation of both proposals you have been assigned.

Your review should comment constructively on aspects of the design of the study and outline in a few sentences the features of the study that are relevant for deciding on soundness of design and fairness to participants.

You should indicate whether you think the study is ethical and why or why not. If you think it isn't ethical, try to suggest alternatives or ways of fixing it.

Write this review so that it is sufficient to explain the study to the review group (most of whom won't have read it) and so that they will be informed enough to vote on whether or not the study is methodologically sound and acceptable ethically.

For the proposal on which you are the primary reviewer, your written comments will serve as notes for your presentation to the group.

**Things I expect in each of your reviews:**

1. Short summary of the proposal
2. Why things did the author do well?
3. What things could be improved (task, experiment, confounds to control, grammar, description?)
4. Are the implications warranted? Is the author over-stretching its possible implications?  
Maybe you have some ideas?
5. Length of the proposal. If it is more than 2 pages, what do you recommend the author to do to reduce it.

**Things I do NOT want to see:**

1. Vague critiques like "I don't think you measure what you think you measured" (Why? What makes it a not valid measurement?)
2. Focusing only on the negative things or errors.
3. BS (Your feedback will help the authors improve their proposals for their project so keep in mind how you can be useful. I expect good quality reviews and you & your peers deserve that).
4. I will not tolerate assholes in this class so be NICE

*On Peer Review day* the primary reviewer will provide the summary described in the previous paragraph, the secondary reviewer will agree or disagree with specific points, and the group will discuss the proposal. The secondary reviewer will take notes of such discussion and share any relevant points with the author(s). The above procedure of the peer group review discussion is very similar to that with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) use to determine the scientific merit of grant proposals