

Peer Review of Rough Draft

Peer review is an essential part of modern professional engineering work. Review allows other colleagues or collaborators to give constructive feedback to an engineer to improve a piece of writing or analysis. Constructive feedback involves both identifying for the author what is done well and what could be improved. Feedback can and should cover all areas of the paper including content, presentation of ideas and information, and style and formatting. In this activity, you will review a PBL (or Wiki) rough draft and provide constructive recommendations and suggestions to improve the report (or Wiki).

Directions:

1. Read the report (Wiki) once through in its entirety.
2. Complete the review by answering the questions on the next page. Whenever possible, provide specific examples or recommendations using page and paragraph numbers.
3. If desired, provide additional comments / annotations on the rough draft itself.
4. Submit your review electronically via Canvas.
5. Also print out 1 copy to hand to the report author(s) the day the review is due.

Report Title: _____

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____

Content

1. Please summarize the main topic and thesis of the report/Wiki:

2. What aspect(s) did you like most and/or find most interesting? What was done well?

3. What does the report/wiki contribute that represents original thinking? What is new and above and beyond the prior work (references) cited by the report/wiki?

Presentation of Ideas and information

4. Does the abstract (wikis only) summarize the main content and contribution of the paper in one paragraph? If not, what should be added or removed?

5. Is the report/wiki logically organized? If not, how could the organization be improved?

6. Do the conclusions reiterate the main findings without presenting any new information? If not, what should be added or removed?

7. What parts of the paper were unclear? Can you offer suggestions to make the writing more clear?

Style, Formatting, and References

8. Are tables and figures numbered, appropriately titled, and presented in the proper format (as for Engineering reports)? Are all tables and figures referred to in the text?
9. If used, are Equations numbered, parameters and variables defined, and appropriate units specified?
10. Are consistent significant figures and units used in the text and tables?
11. Is prior work cited and are references listed in the correct format? Are at least two of the references to articles outside the USU domain (wikis only)?

Concluding Notes

12. In looking over the Grading Rubric, are there any other areas that could use improvement that are not addressed in the above questions?
13. What additional comments, feedback, or suggestions can you offer the author?