**Peer-Review: Tips For Responding to Other People’s Writing**

**(Source: http://wac.gmu.edu/supporting/prg\_template.pdf)**

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(return this form with the marked copy of the paper)

Author: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(when the comments are returned to you, keep this form with the marked copy and place in portfolio)

1. **Say something positive.** It is just as important to know what we are doing well in our writing as what things need improvement. **Reviewer – what did the author do well in his/her paper?**

2. **Talk about your responses while reading the work.** “When I read this sentence, I wondered if the paragraph was going to be about this topic.” **Reviewer – mark the paper with these comments.**

3. **Give the writer something to walk away with.** But don’t try to write the paper for the writer by telling him/her what to say and how to say it. Write out your key comments and suggestions on the back of the paper or on a separate sheet of paper so the writer can refer to them later while revising.

**Reviewer – what did you learn from this author?**

**Higher Order Concerns – Reviewer – answer each question below (more on back)**

1. What is the writer’s position (thesis/main point)? Is that position clearly communicated to the reader? **Mark the places in the text where the position is articulated and argued.**

2. What evidence does the writer provide to support his/her position? Is the evidence persuasive? Specific enough? Well-documented if from another source? Does the evidence match the point being made?

3. How is the piece of writing organized? Does the writer follow a logical sequence to guide the reader through his/her reasoning? Are transitions needed? What about other organizational cues, like headings and subheadings if called for by the discipline?

4. Think about the overall effectiveness of the piece. Does the writer accomplish his/her goals? If not, point to one or more areas where the writer should focus his/her attention for the next revision.

**Lower Order Concerns – Reviewer – mark technical/stylistic errors if you find them, but feel free to ignore these and focus on the Higher Order Concerns.**

1. Are the “mechanics” correct, e.g. sentence structure, sentence syntax (the phrasing and word choice), grammar, punctuation, citations, and, of course, spelling?

2. Are there stylistic problems you find annoying? (Unclear use of “this” and “it”? Wordiness)