**PEER REVIEWING GUIDE**

*The main purpose of peer review is to help you get constructive feedback and train your reviewing skills*

**General Rule: Give feedback in the way you wish others would give it to you**

**Structure of a peer review session**

* Introduction of peers and guidelines,10 min
* Matching peers, 5  min
* Presenting text to partner and explain on, 20 min (2 x 10) which parts / aspects you wish feedback
* Reading and Editing, 60 min
* BREAK
* Feedback, 30 min (2 x 15)
* Reflection of benefits of exercise,15 min
* Closing round,10 min

We recommend checking the text for:

1. ***Clarity - Look for major mistakes:*** Read through once fully without editing. Take it all in.

Checklist for clarity:
- What is the main hypothesis/research question?
- Do the ideas flow logically?
- Is the statement clear?
- Is there supporting proof?
- Is there important information missing?
2. ***Cohesion - Look for minor mistakes/concerns:*** Read through for a second time and put your editor’s hat on.

Checklist for cohesion:
- Are there adequate transitions?
- Are there any keywords, if so, what?
- Are there any issues that challenge the clarity of the thought? – Avoid the use of the passive voice and switch to the active voice (We collected vegetation samples … vs. The vegetation samples were collected), and watch out for the subject/verb separation
3. ***Concision: Look for what can be removed/Can you make it simpler?*** Read through for a third time and get ready for a make-over montage!

- Cut the clutter/fluff
- Use verbs (implementation of. vs. implement)

**Examples of unconstructive vs. constructive comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Unconstructive** | **Constructive** |
| “The introduction is confusing. Fix it.” | “The introduction is lacking an explicit statement problem so it was hard to understand what the exact aim of the research is.” |
| “This doesn’t make sense.” | “The argument in the third paragraph is strong, but I think it would be more effective if you moved it to the second paragraph, where the related evidence is presented. This would create a smoother logical flow.” |
| “huh?” | “The sentence and the verb are too far apart – switch to active voice to close this syntactic gap.” |

**General tips for peer editing:**

* Be kind (what is working well) and avoid killer comments!
* Be critical… but with detail! What isn’t exactly working and how can it be improved?
* Consider your words
* Ask questions when something is not clear

***Source:*** *Laura Mahoney, Writer’s Studio @ESGC, 2023.*