Seed Removal – Peer Review Evaluation: 20 pts

Peer-review is an essential part of scientific writing; being an effective reviewer will improve your own skill at writing and permit you to contribute to the quality of others work. Your edits and comments on the rough draft of the seed removal paper **must reflect your thorough understanding of the paper's quality and content.** Therefore, we will evaluate your peer-review work on two major bases: 1) the quality of your editing of grammar/syntax/paper content (7 points) and 2) the thoroughness of your comments and suggestions towards improving the quality of the paper (13 points).

Week of Sep 30: Peer-Review due. Editors will hand in TWO copies of the work they edited to the TA at the beginning of class. One will be distributed to the original author and one will be graded by the TA.

1) The original will be returned to author anonymously during lab; editors only include student ID number for identification. Use the next week to work on peer-review revisions.

2) Return the second copied version of the edited work to the TA with the rubric below attached for evaluation.

Seed Removal – Peer Review Evaluation: 20 pts

Editor Student ID Number: _____

Author ID Number: _____

Editing Content	EARNED	POSSIBLE
Paper Flow – Does the reviewer address the clarity of the paper? • Reviewer provides comments regarding the flow of sentences • Provides comments regarding the flow between paragraphs (i.e. effective use of topic sentences) • Provides comments regarding extraneous words/sentences/subjects		2
Paper Content – Does the reviewer address the logic of the paper? • Reviewer provides comments regarding the absence of important background info/methods/ results/discussion topics • Provides comments regarding the appropriateness/usefulness of figures (e.g. are key figures missing? do multiple figures essentially show the same information?)		4
Grammar, Syntax, and Spelling • Reviewer identifies major writing errors in the report		1

Thoroughness of comments/suggestions		
Deficiencies – • Reviewer addresses deficiencies in the work • Reviewer gives clear suggestions for improvements/additions		6
Highlights – • Reviewer comments on aspects of the work that are well-written and particularly effective		6
Summary – • Reviewer provides a summary of review at end of paper that identifies major areas for improvement and strongly written sections of paper		1

Total		20