Peer review assignment:

1. Read through the paper, putting in helpful comments. Comments should be at the larger level (e.g., How do these concepts relate to each other? How is X different than Y? How does your manipulation get at Z?) and at the lower level (e.g., grammatical errors, passive voice). Use the readings for this week and the information from the Readings class on writing and reviewing as well as this guide to help you.

2. When you have finished, write a review of the paper as if you were reviewing it for a journal.

3. You will be graded on your own comments on the other person’s paper as well as on how well you responded to your reviewer’s comments (as indicated by your response to their review that you’ll turn in with the paper).

Abstract

* Does the abstract give a clear summary of the paper? Is the length appropriate?

Introduction

* Does the paper start out with a broad, interesting introduction and set up the topics to be covered?
* Are the sections well-organized with appropriate headings?
* Does the author use topic sentences?
* Is there an appropriate amount of detail on studies (not too much or too little)?
* Does the author explain and integrate previous research?
* Are there good transitions between and within paragraphs?
* Does the review give a balanced and complete view of previous research in the area?
* Are relevant theories discussed?
* Is the research up-to-date, with important classic studies mentioned as well?
* Is the research organized by topic instead of by study, and does this logical organization flow throughout the intro?
* Are all the important concepts in the study addressed in the introduction?
* Are the relationships between the concepts clear?
* Are operational definitions of important concepts clear?
* Is there a section near the end that sets up the study? Does it make it clear how the hypotheses derive from previous research?
* Are the hypotheses clear and stated in testable form?
* Is the rationale for the study and its design clear?

Method

* Is the specification of the design correct? Are mediators or moderators correctly labeled?
* Does the author describe adequately how the participants would be recruited?
* Does the method make sense? Are there demand characteristics or things participants would be suspicious about?
* Does the method actually test the hypothesis?
* Does the author include measures of control variables and potential confounds?
* Are there threats to internal validity that could be reduced?
* Are the operational definitions of the variables clear? Do they make sense? Is there a way to test whether they are effective?
* Does the procedure section follow clearly from what happens when people first show up through when they leave the study? Is there enough detail that you could run their study?
* Are the measures described adequately, including sample items, number of items, how they are answered, and reliability and validity?
* Are measures included in an appendix?
* Is there an adequate debriefing?
* Did the author include the special sections (e.g., ethics, validity) required for this assignment?

Results

* Does the author address any transformations of the data, manipulation checks, missing data procedures, etc. that are relevant? Are these procedures adequate?
* Do the analyses proposed test the hypotheses? Are they appropriate analyses to run?
* Are there violations of assumptions of these tests? Or should those be tested?
* Is the information that the author proposes to list adequate (e.g., effect sizes and confidence intervals as well as p values)?
* Is the description of the expected results clear and easy to follow?

Discussion

* Does the author summarize the expected findings clearly? Do these expected findings match up with the hypotheses?
* Does the author address what these findings would mean for theory and/or practice?
* Does the author address what failure to find these results might mean?  
  Does the author address at least 2 limitations (good ones) and 2 ideas for future research (ideally linked to the limitations)?
* Does the paper end with a strong take-home message?

Grammar/writing style

* Are the references (in text and at the end) in APA style?
* Are all the references in the text in the references section and vice versa?
* Are the cover page, abstract, headings, etc. in APA style?
* Does the author avoid colloquial terms and contractions?
* Are words used in their literal sense (e.g., whereas only for comparison, since only for time)?
* Is there passive voice?
* Is the paper in the correct verb tense?
* Do all sentences have a noun and a verb?
* Are appendices appropriately labeled? Are they all there (including demographics)?