**Reviewer’s Checklist – Summary 2 – Rough Draft Date of Review: \_\_1/20/22\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s Name:** | **SUMMARY AUTHOR’S NAME: Aidan Hopper** | |
| **+/-** | **Component** | **Reviewer’s Comments:** | **Codes:** for 1-8 |
| + | 1. Double spaced | Author used double space | 0 |
| + | 1. Document has a title | Author has a title | 0 |
| / | 1. Original title and author are included | Author included original title but not author, added the original author in corrections | 13 |
| + | 1. Author indicates that this is a summary. | Author indicated this is a summary in title of document | 0 |
| + | 1. Has a clear, accurate overall thesis statement; is in 1st paragraph. | Author indicates what document will contain in their first paragraph | 0 |
| + | 1. Sections are clearly noted; how many? All have headings? | Author has seven sections of the summary each section has a heading indicating what it will be about | 0 |
| + | 1. Written in third person | Author wrote in third person | 0 |
| + | 1. Discussion included? Has a heading? | Discussion has a heading clearly marked | 0 |
| + | 1. Each section has a topic statement | Author indicates what each section will be about in first sentence. | |
| + | 1. Personal opinions not included | Author did not use personal opinions | |
| + | 1. There is a conclusion | Author has a conclusion clearly stated | |
| / | 1. ALL parts of the original document are covered? What’s missing? | The only thing that is missing is a section regarding the Annex. I suggest adding a brief summarization regarding it. | |
| + | 1. Coherent, logical flow with transitions | Paragraphs work well off each other and make sense; it sticks with the topic of the section. | |
| + | 1. Sentence structure is varied and correct. | Most sentences were good on length I did make a comment on where I felt a sentence should be broken up | |
| + | 1. Spelling; verbiage | Few grammatical errors | |
|  | 1. Where could the author improve: |  | |
| + | * 1. Grammar | Few grammatical errors did not have to make many changes | |
| + | * 1. Being Concise? Wordy? | Made a couple changes to be more concise but otherwise good | |
| + | * 1. Clarity | Easy to follow along and everything made sense | |
| + | 1. Sentence fragments | No sentence fragments that stood out, overall sentence structure was good | |
| + | 1. Parallelism | Author was consistent with the topic of the summary | |
| + | 1. Commas, colons, semicolons, and other punctuation | Barely any punctuation mistakes added a few comments where periods could be. | |
| + | 1. No quotes | Author did not use quotes | |

**KEY: (these go in the column on the far left)**

**+**  = good as it is; maybe slight changes / = needs more work **-** = needs more attention value: 9 pts