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# **Review Form**

Version: November 2009.

## **Instructions to Reviewers:**

Please provide a numeric rating on a 5-point scale for each question, along with a brief rationale for each numeric rating. In doing so, please discuss both the strengths and the weaknesses of each paper so that the editors can understand your reasoning should other reviewers arrive at different ratings.

Please phrase your reviews politely; even 'bad' papers represent a lot of work on the part of the authors. The review may be the basis for further revisions of the paper or the work that the paper reports. We all know how hurtful a needlessly negative review can be, and how helpful a positive one can be; please try to bear that in mind when you are writing yours.

## **Confidential Comments to the Editor**

(Please cut/paste these into the labeled box in the score sheet on Manucscript Central:<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/toce>)

## **Comments to the Author**

(Please cut/paste from here to end of form into the labeled box in the score sheet on Manuscript Central)

1. Paper title:

2. Please summarize the paper in a few sentences.

3. Can the content be directly applied by classroom instructors or curriculum designers?

[5] Directly and obviously applicable

...

[1] Not applicable to classroom instruction or curriculum design

4. Does the work appeal to a broad readership interested in computing education?

[5] Broad ... [1] Narrow

5. Does the work address a significant problem?

[5] Significant ... [1] Insignificant

6. Does the author build upon relevant references and bodies of knowledge

[5] Relevant and sufficient references to existing bodies of knowledge

...

[1] Few if any relevant references

7. Is the teaching intervention adequately evaluated in terms of its impact on learning in actual use?

[5] Excellent evaluation ... [1] Inadequate evaluation

8. Does the author use methods appropriate to the goals, both for the instructional intervention and the evaluation of impact on learning?

[5] Appropriate methods ... [1] Inappropriate or unclear methods

9. Did the author provide sufficient detail to replicate and evaluate?

[5] Sufficient detail ... [1] Insufficient detail

10. Is the paper clearly and carefully written?

[5] excellent [4] very good [3] acceptable [2] weak [1] unacceptable

11. Does the paper adhere to accepted standards of style, usage, and composition?

[5] excellent [4] very good [3] acceptable [2] weak [1] unacceptable

## **Summary Comments:**