

Assignment type: *Research Proposal*

Source: *University of West Florida (Retrieved April 21, from*

<http://uwf.edu/media/university-of-west-florida/offices/cutla/documents/peer-review-guidelines.pdf>)

Peer Review: Draft of Research Proposal

Directions: Please type your comments. Include your name as the reviewer. Identify the name of the author of the proposal reviewed and the title of the proposal.

Please provide comments that will help the author improve the quality of his or her work. You should assign a numeric score for each element (0 - 3) to reflect the quality of the reviewed work.

Each of the following elements should be given a score from 3 - 0.

3 = the author has completely and thoroughly addressed this issue

2 = the issue was addressed, but some elements are unclear or inadequately addressed

1 = the issue was addressed in a superficial way; there are significant problems with clarity, accuracy, or completeness

0 = the element was not addressed

These scores are used only for feedback purposes. The expectation is that most papers will receive a less-than-perfect score. However, whenever a less-than-perfect score is assigned for a given element, your comments should clearly identify problems that detracted from this score.

You may make additional comments directly on the manuscript (this works best for comments about grammar, APA style, clarity of writing, etc.).

1. Clear statement of the research problem. Does the paper identify a clear issue that is recognizable from the title and the content of the first paragraph?

2. Completeness & breadth of the literature reviewed. Has the paper adequately and clearly summarized previous research that is focused on the problem? Has the relevance of research been explained clearly? Has the author avoided descriptions of research that is not clearly related to the topic?

3. Analysis of the research problem. Does the author identify relations between findings, gaps, contradictions, and inconsistencies in the literature? Are reasonable suggestions made for resolving these? Has the author provided a clear rationale for the importance of the problem?

4. Articulation of findings in literature review. Does the author select the proper information to present? For example, does the author cite and present findings when needed to support assertions, provide the appropriate methodological context for understanding these findings, and provide detailed descriptions of methodology only when these are required? Identify ideas that should have been supported with citations, missing citations, references at the end of the introduction that are not cited in the text of the introduction.

5. Logic and Organization of the introduction. Are paragraphs focused on particular issues? Are issues addressed in a logical order? Is there a reasonable concluding paragraph? Is the introduction of an appropriate length?
6. Methods: Will the manipulations of the variables proposed by the author address the research problem in a meaningful way? Will the dependent measures provide meaningful and reliable evidence relevant to the research question(s). If not, describe your concerns.
7. Results: Have the basic findings been adequately presented and described verbally? The results described here will not be “genuine” data but quantitative statements of expected effects. Thus, expect to find descriptive statistics for planned comparisons. Does the author describe the direction of statistically significant differences between groups or the direction of statistically reliable correlations? Values for statistical tests should not be provided, but the types of statistical analyses planned should be described. Have the appropriate statistical tests been proposed? Does each statistical test presented answer a specific question posed in the introduction? Have any questions been left unanswered (i.e., no relevant evidence or statistical analysis presented).
8. Does the author discuss the implications of the proposed research findings in terms of contribution to theoretical knowledge, solving a practical problem, etc. Does the author connect the new study to the existing body of scientific knowledge in a meaningful way?
9. Quality of writing. Is the paper understandable? Comment on overall use of grammar, clarity of writing, organization of material within sections, and APA style.
10. References. Does the author provide appropriate citations for sources? Is APA style used correctly when citing material in the paper and in the entries in the reference section? Are there an adequate number of appropriate references? Does the author rely too much on secondary sources, internet sites, or non-primary literature?
11. Overall impression of the paper.