**Research Proposal Peer Review**

Adapted from https://writingcenter.kennesaw.edu/oer/literature\_review/proposal\_peer\_review.php

**Reviewer:**

**Writer:**

**As a writer . . .**

**Step 1:** Send answers to the following two questions to your reviewers on slack:

* What questions do you have for your reviewer?
* List two concerns you have about your proposal that you’d like feedback on

**Step 2:**When you receive your peer's feedback, read and consider it carefully.

* Remember: you are not bound to accept everything your reader suggests; if you believe that the response comes as a result of misunderstanding your intentions, be sure that those intentions are clear. The problem can be either with the reader or the writer!

**As a reviewer . . .**

**Fill in Steps 1-5 in this document and send to the person you are reviewing and turn in on Moodle**

As you begin writing your peer review, remember that your peers benefit more from constructive criticism than vague praise. A comment like "I got confused here" or "I saw your point clearly here" is more useful than "It looks okay to me." Point out ways your classmates can improve their work.

**Step 1: Read your peer’s draft two times**

* Read the draft once to get an overview of the paper, and a second time to provide constructive criticism for the author to use when revising the draft.

**Step 2: Answer the following questions** (brieflyhere in this document)**:**

* Does the proposal include an abstract that summarizes the background, research questions, methods and what the importance is?
* Does the proposal have at least two figures/tables/schematics?
* Does the draft include an introduction/background that establishes the purpose of the proposal and provides a thoughtful explanation of the proposal’s significance by communicating why the project is important?
* Does the background section include at least five credible sources on the topic?
* Are these cited in context that is relevant to those references?
* Have the research questions been well-stated? Are they clear?
* Are the research questions relevant to the background and methodology? Is it clear why those questions are significant?
* In the methodology section, has the writer explained what methods they will use clearly and sufficiently? Is the methodology thought out and reasonable? Does it relate well to the research questions?
* Is the timeline well-described, and does it make sense with respect to the research questions? Is the amount of work proposed realistic within the timeline?
* Have the broader impacts been well described and reasonable? Are they relevant to the proposed research?
* What did you find most interesting about this draft?

**Step 3: Address your peer's questions and concerns sent on slack**

**Step 4: Write a short paragraph about what the writer does especially well**

**Step 5: Write a short paragraph about what you think the writer should do to improve the draft**

Your suggestions will be the most useful part of peer review for your classmates, so focus more of your time on these paragraphs.

**Hints for peer review:**

* Point out the strengths in the essay.
* Address the larger issues first.
* Make specific suggestions for improvement.
* Be tactful but be candid and direct.
* Don't be afraid to disagree with the author or another reviewer.
* Make and receive comments in a useful way.
* Remember peer review is not an editing service.