Peer Review of PRIMARY LITERATURE STYLE PAPERS BIO303 Fall 2011

Guidelines: This peer reviews are completed anonymously. The goal of this process is to help the author(s) to write a more clear, more readable, paper. As you are working on this review, you should keep in mind that you want to be **CLEAR, CONSTRUCTIVE, AND KIND** (ultimately the same type of reviews that you hope to receive).

Use the provided coversheet to remind you of the qualities and requirements for the various elements of the paper you are reviewing. Comment on how well the author(s) addressed the points, and give suggestions for editing and expanding on their ideas. Remember this is less about how you would approach the subject or topic, and more about how the authors can optimize their own approach and style.

Reviewer's role (in terms of grading): You will be evaluated on how well you assess the strengths/ weaknesses in the document, as well as the quality and accuracy of your suggestions for improving the paper. You will be graded on the reviews that you completed. Your grade will not be higher for giving only laudatory comments (when not necessarily warranted), nor will it be high for being harshly critical.

Authors' role in responding to reviews: You will be graded on how well you consider suggestions made by your reviewer(s) in the completion of your final draft.

Instructions:

1. Read through paper one time, to in order to familiarize yourself with the content.

2. Read the paper again. Do not line edit the paper, but rather, focus on what the author is trying to *say*. If there are major grammar and spelling concerns that you observe, select a sample paragraph to mark extensively, and let the author(s) know that this would be recommended throughout.

3. For each section of the paper, fill out the chart gauging how well the authors met the criteria, and where appropriate, add more detailed comments.

Paper Title	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Title specific and informative				
Contains relevant key words				
Abstract	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
States the aims and scope of the paper				
Concise				
Abstract can stand alone, apart from the body of the paper, and fully describe the hypothesis, results and conclusion				
Introduction	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Presents issue and give rationale for paper				
Gives appropriate background on all relevant topics included in the paper				
State the major questions and objectives				

Materials and Methods	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Explains **all** procedures used in the results section of the paper				
All relevant information is included, and is sufficient to repeat each experiment				
Materials used are not listed or bulleted				
Instructions are specific (samples were centrifuged at 13x g for 1 minute vs. samples were spun at full speed)				
Unnecessary details are not included (eg. 100µl were pipetted into a 500 ml sterile beaker); concentrations and dilutions are used instead of volumes				
Results	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Subheadings are clear and informative				
Hypothesis being tested for each experiment are stated prior to giving data				
Figures and tables are supported by the text, but do not stand in place of text in the body of results section				

Results are not interpreted				
All figures/tables are referred to in the body of the text				
Data in tables/figures are consistent with text				
Figures/Tables/Figure and Table Legends	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Images in figures are appropriately cropped, labeled, and laid out (A, B, C labels added, as are markings for lanes/ladders)				
Legends have summary title sentences (usually in bold) and have all relevant information				
All are required/none are missing or omitted				
Discussion	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Address the major implications of findings				
Results are interpreted in respect to other literature				
Considers problems in results/data/techniques as well as inconsistencies				
Future experiments suggested				

References/Literature Cited	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
All sources cited in paper appear in literature cited section				
Documentation is in CSE style (Name, Date)				
Information about all sources are accurate and complete (not including extra, extraneous information)				
Adequate number of references utilized				
Layout and Organization	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Good overall structure- Ideas ordered effectively				
Transitions used appropriately				
Introduction & conclusion focus clearly on the main point				
Paragraphs right length for reading (not too long or too short)				
Grammar and Style	**Weak**	**Satisfactory**	**Strong**	**NOTES**
Topic and level of formality appropriate for audience				

Sentences and words vary				
Wordiness avoided				

Council of Science Editors (CSE) Citation Style Guide: SHORT GUIDE (adapted)

IN TEXT CITATIONS

Use the Name, Year format. See examples:

. . . was determined (Smith et al., 2007).

. . . was discovered in 2007 (Smith et al., 2007) and subsequently refuted in 2009 (Smythe et al., 2009).

. . . was discovered in simultaneous, yet separate efforts (Smith et al, 2007; Smitty et al. 2007).

LITERATURE CITED

Articles
Print articles

Capone M, Grizzle R, Mathieson AC, Odell J. 2008. Intertidal oysters in northern New England. Northeast Nat. 15(2):209-214.

Electronic Articles

Bertness MD, Ewan PJ, Silliman BR. 2002. Anthropogenic modification of New England salt marsh landscapes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 99(3):1395-1398

Websites

Scitable [Internet]. Nature Education; 2008 [cited 2009 January 9]. Available from: http://www.nature.com/scitable

Proceedings

Nenon T, editor. 2007. The first-person perspective in philosophical inquiry. Spindel Conference; September 28-30, 2006; University of Memphis. Memphis, Tenn: University of Memphis, Dept. of Philosophy. 186 p. 1.

Books
One author

Dudgeon D. 2008. Tropical stream ecology. London, UK; Burlington, MA: Academic Press.

Two to ten authors (include all!)

Wessels T, Cohen BD, Zwinger A. 1997. Reading the forested landscape: a natural history of New England. Woodstock, VT; New York: Countryman Press.

Eleven or more authors

List the first 10 authors followed by "et al." or "and others".

Editor, translator, or compiler instead of author

Joas M, Jahn D, Kern, editors. 2008. Governing a common sea: environmental policies in the Baltic Sea region. London; Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Parts of Books

Fastovsky DE, Weishampel DB. 2005. The evolution and extinction of the dinosaurs. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5, The origin of the dinosaurian; p. 87-98.
Electronic Books

Adapted from:
Committee COSESM. 2006. Scientific style and format. Council of Science Editors

Resources Consulted

Committee, C. O. S. E. S. M. (2006). *Scientific style and format*. the CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers (p. 658). Council of Science Editors.

Department, B. (2011, September 19). Peer Review Form. *http://abacus.bates.edu/~ganderso/biology/resources/PEER_REVIEW_FORM_PDF.pdf*. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from http://abacus.bates.edu/~ganderso/biology/resources/PEER_REVIEW_FORM_PDF.pdf

McMillan, V., & McMillan, V. (1997). *Writing papers in the biological sciences*.

Peer Review Groups & Criteria Grids. (n.d.). Peer Review Groups & Criteria Grids. *mwp.hawaii.edu*. Retrieved November 2, 2011, from http://www.mwp.hawaii.edu/resources/peer_review.htm#developforms