

ENVS 410/510 Peer Review Format

Your name:

Author's name:

1) Read the entire manuscript initially to get a general impression of it, asking questions such as:
1) What environmental question did it address? What data will be used? Is it interesting? What did you learn? Was it easy to read?

Give your general impressions of the manuscript here:

2) Then go back and read the paper again, more analytically this time. Make corrections on the manuscript itself, but also respond to each of the following sections.

a. Introduction

- Has the author set the stage for the problem? Is the concept and question well developed and contextualized?
- Does the content of the introduction seem relevant to the identified question and approach?
- Are all statements referenced with quality literature?
- Are the hypotheses clear and in a logical order? Are they directional using predictions?
- Has the author proofread the manuscript for spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors?

Comments.

b. Data overview

* Do the datasets meet requirements? * Is there sufficient metadata and information about the data structure to understand how it will be used? Is there as much information as would be returned by the str() function?

Comments.

c. Workflow

* Are the end-product visualization goals appropriate and feasible given the data?

* Has the author accounted for all relevant QAQC?

* Is there a logical flow from the raw data to the end products? If not, what suggestions would you make?

Comments.