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An important goal of a research paper is to communicate the research in a clear, understandable way to others. It has been said “If you can’t explain it simply, you don’t understand it well enough.” In the peer review process, the reviewer serves the role of a reader (**not** a teacher, content expert, or writing tutor), and in that role, can provide the author with valuable feedback regarding how clearly and effectively the author has presented and supported their findings. The author can utilize the reviewer’s feedback, along with feedback from the professor and the Writing Center, to revise and polish the paper for final submission.

The peer review process is also valuable to the reviewer. Reading the work of your peer can help you a) think more carefully about your research and how you have presented it, and b) build your skills as a critical reader and writer as you identify strengths and areas for improvement in your peer’s paper and consider recommendations for changes to be made.

***Answer the following questions as or after you review your peer’s paper.***

**THE RESEARCH QUESTION**

1. Identify and, in your own words, restate the writer’s research question. What “puzzle” is the writer trying to solve?

If a sender and receiver are drawn from a linguistic community such that in one scenario, they use the same ‘knowledge’ to encode and decode messages individually, and in another scenario, the sender and receiver are drawn from separate communities and individually only have the ability to encode/decode messages, will the demonstrated 'communicative ability' between the two scenarios be different?

1. Identify and, in your own words, state the significance or relevance - the “So What?” - of the research question to larger disciplinary issues. How effective is the writer in communicating this significance and relevance such that you, the reader, care about their research?

Not discussed in the paper—likely equates to a simulated study on language barriers in different environments

**ARGUMENT**

1. What is the author’s thesis - the main point of their argument? Please restate the thesis in your own words.

If the sender and receiver are drawn from the same linguistic community and use the same ‘knowledge’ to encode/decode messages, their demonstrated ‘communicative ability’ will converge to a different value than if the sender and receiver are drawn from different communities.

1. Look back at the research question you identified. How does the author’s thesis address that question?

The author’s thesis addresses the question by stating explicitly that they do not expect that the two scenarios will result in the sender and receiver establishing the same efficacy in communication.

1. Identify and list the major claims the author makes in support of their thesis. If you have difficulty identifying the claims, what suggestions do you have for the author to strengthen and clarify those claims?

Note: ABSTRACT/INTRODUCTION NOT WRITTEN YET

**EVIDENCE & ANALYSIS**

**Note: ABSTRACT/INTRODUCTION NOT WRITTEN YET**

1. Identify the evidence the writer uses to support their claims.
   1. How sufficient is the evidence for each claim?
   2. How relevant is the evidence for each claim?

**EVIDENCE & ANALYSIS (cont’d)**

1. How well does the writer analyze the evidence, clearly demonstrating how and why the selected evidence supports the relevant claim? Highlight instances of particularly strong analysis, as well as places where the analysis should be stronger. Do you have any suggestions for how the author might make their analysis stronger?
2. How well has the writer documented and cited their sources?

**STRUCTURE & ORGANIZATION**

**Note: ABSTRACT/INTRODUCTION NOT WRITTEN YET**

1. How well does the writer lead the reader through their argument? Identify any points where you, as the reader, were confused or had difficulty following the writer’s thought process. Do you have any suggestions for how the author might reorganize portions of their paper to resolve these issues?

**STRUCTURE & ORGANIZATION (cont’d)**

1. How effectively does the writer use transitions to create a smooth experience for the reader? Highlight particularly strong transitions, as well as places where more effective transitions would be useful.
2. At the paragraph level, identify paragraphs that lack coherence (i.e., that do not focus on one controlling idea).

**LANGUAGE**

1. Does the writer consistently use an appropriately academic tone and voice? Identify any use of informal, casual, or conversational language.

The writer does consistently use an appropriate academic tone and voice.

1. How effectively does the writer use terms from the discipline? Does the writer provide sufficient explanation for terms that might be unfamiliar to the reader? Identify any terms that require clarification.

The author very effectively uses terms from the discipline, but does not effectively explain the definitions of words that may not be familiar to readers, such as the terms ‘linguistic community’ or ‘referential game.’

1. Identify any instances where the language (sentence structure, word choice, and/or grammar) is unclear or contributes to potential misunderstanding.