Reviewer’s name:

Author’s name:

Date:

Blog Post: Peer Review

**1. Content**

* First, read through the blog post and mark where you see the following information:
  + **Researcher name, university, lab, etc.**
  + **Study's main claims**
  + **Study's methods**
  + **Study weaknesses, limitations, etc.**
* Is any information missing? Is any information described in too much detail? Is any information confusing?
* If so, how would you fix it?

**2. Relevance:**

* Read through the blog post again, marking where you see the relevance of the research for a general audience.
* Is the article made sufficiently "relevant"? Is the relevance clear and compelling?
* If not, how would you fix it?

CONTINUES ON BACK

**3. Style:**

* Read through the blog post a third time and identify 2-3 places where the tone seems particularly appropriate to the chosen newspaper, and 2-3 places (if there are any) where the tone seems to stray from the newspaper.
* If you identified any places where the style is inconsistent, what do you think makes them that way?
* What would you recommend to fix these inconsistencies?