

Rubric for assessing peer review

The material you will receive for peer review can differ significantly: while some of you receive a few pages with a basic plan, others might receive full near-ready papers. That's why what you will be assessed on in this assignment is how well you can deal with the material you receive. If available, you can comment on separate essay sections and use the essay evaluation checklist for guidance. Your main objectives are to provide an overall impression of the draft paper you are reviewing, comment on what you find good in the paper, as well as provide constructive and balanced suggestions for improvement. The idea is to avoid general formulations by always substantiating your choices: e.g. "I found this paper very interesting because X and Y" or "The authors did a good job on choosing the methods because X and Y." You will not be assessed on the quality of your English language, but attention will be paid to the manner in which you communicate feedback. Please, see the detailed assessment rubric below.

	Excellent (9-10)	Very Good (8-8.9)	Good (7-7.9)	Sufficient (6-6.9)	Poor (5.9 and below)
Overall impression (25%)	A compelling motivation for the paper grade is provided based on the thorough reading of the paper and critical engagement with the material. The overall impression gives a good idea on what the paper is about, and what it takes to complete it in a succinct manner. Specific examples from the paper are used to illustrate the points and ground the overall impression, avoiding the general language. Comparisons beyond the draft paper are used to convey the view.	The review is based on the thorough reading of the paper, demonstrated by clear arguments and illustrated with examples from the paper. The recap of the main ideas in the paper is brief and to the point, supporting the overall impression. The points mentioned are justified and general language is present only occasionally.	The overall impression and the grade are substantiated. Examples are scarce or missing. The argumentation behind the impression is not always clear but follows the paper's logic. The assessment language is predominantly clear, specific and evocative but vague formulations are also present.	The remarks on the draft paper are quite generic and the grade is not substantiated. It is clear that the reviewer engaged with the paper only superficially, from the little specificity, argumentation and few examples. An engagement with the paper does not directly follow from the content of the draft paper. Vague formulations are generally used in the review.	The remarks on the draft paper or the grade are missing, or are generic. The impression of the paper is not supported by the paper. An engagement with the paper does not follow from the content of the draft paper, or simply retells the paper without critically approaching it.
Positive points (25%)	The review identifies several points that are implemented well in the draft paper and argues for why that is the case. Specific examples from the paper are cited and the positive evaluation is clearly grounded in the paper. References to external materials are made to elevate the reviewer's point.	Several positive points are identified as already compelling in the paper and the reviewer justifies their position by calling on specific passages from the paper. The examples from the paper are fitting and helpful to illustrate the points.	The review identifies several points of improvement, briefly discussed and argued for. Some examples from the paper accompany this but their fitness can be questioned.	The review only vaguely identifies some points they find as well implemented, without discussing why they were selected. The supporting examples are contradicting to the identified points, or are missing.	The positive points about the paper are missing or do not correspond to the paper. No examples are used to support the reviewer's points and it is not clear that the reviewer has at all read the draft paper.

Robots and Society course (RO47009) Assessment Peer Review

Improvement points (25%)	The review identifies clear points of improvement that are feasible and speak to the idea of the paper. Specific ways to implement these recommendations are provided. The recommendations for action are balanced. The suggestions are based in clear examples or passages from the paper. Alternative ways out are suggested, should the authors choose not to follow the suggested tips.	The improvement points are formulated in a clear and balanced way, supported by the excerpts from the paper and accompanied by a plan of recommendations that the authors can easily follow. Alternatives are identified but not discussed at length.	The points for improvement are delineated, formulated at places clearly and at places vaguely. The plan for improvement is there but lacks detailed suggestions or alternative ways to follow. Alternatively, the suggested changes are too large to implement and are thus unfeasible.	The review only vaguely identifies some points for improvement, without discussing why they were selected. The recommendations are unfeasible and/or disproportionately large. Alternatively, the suggestions are vaguely formulated or try to change the paper completely.	The improvement points about the paper are missing or do not correspond to the paper. No examples are used to support the reviewer's points and it is not clear that the reviewer has at all read the draft paper.
Manner of feedback (25%)	The reviewer addresses the authors and the draft paper respectfully, provides suggestions in a balanced manner and tries to engage with the original intention of the authors as much as possible. It provides external tips and resources when fitting.	The tone of the review is cordial and constructive, not overly optimistic or pessimistic. It corresponds to the spirit of the paper and unless it is necessary to contradict the authors, does so based on arguments, respectfully and provides alternatives.	The feedback is communicated in a to-the-point and not-offensive language. The tone may sometimes be emotional or use generic formulations (e.g. filler phrases and weasel words) to support the point but it is not compromising the overall impression from the review.	The reviewer's tone is moderate, neither overly positive or negative, mirroring a descriptive narration. In its neutrality, it may miss persuasiveness to convey the review's message.	The reviewer's text is emotionally charged and contains personal attacks and/or disrespectful messages, directly or indirectly. There are considerable attempts to change the paper completely.