Peer Editing Template:

*To be pasted into the end of the original document or attached in a separate file.*

Writer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reader: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Read the paper through once, rather quickly, without pausing to write comments. Then put the paper aside and answer the following questions without looking back. (If you cannot answer the question, write “don’t know.”)

1. What do you think is the writer’s main point?
2. What is the writer’s thesis statement?

Now reread the paper, making any comments in the margins or via track changes that might be helpful for the writer. Try to comment on development and organization of ideas: Do you understand the points the writer is trying to make? Do ideas seem well-connected? Remember, your job is to evaluate clarity of exposition and transparency of logic. You are expected to evaluate the paper as a self-contained entity, and therefore are not expected to read the articles upon which the paper is based. Comments should be concrete and constructive.

1. List two things you like about this paper.
2. List two ways in which this paper could be improved.
3. What in the paper was confusing to you? (if so, briefly explain)
4. What would you like to know more about? What questions do you still have?