COLLEAGUE FEEDBACK SHEET FOR RESEARCH PAPERS

Author:

Title:

Responder:

- Over the next two days, read your colleague's first submission and carefully evaluate its content and clarity.
- Use the following guidelines to provide feedback for your colleague. Be as thorough and constructive as possible because your comments will play a large role in determining the quality of your colleague’s submission. Use the back of these pages if necessary.

WHAT DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT THE MANUSCRIPT?

OVER-ALL EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON CONTENT AND CLARITY

1. Is the writing clear and concise throughout? Is there minimal and appropriate use of the passive voice? Underline poorly worded sentences and identify them with an Awk. For a few of these sentences, offer suggestions of how to modify them to make them clearer by re-writing the sentence.

2. Are there places in the writing where ideas do not seem connected, or where the flow of ideas breaks down? Identify these places by writing "stitch together" (or something of the sort) and indicate directly on the manuscript (a) why & where you became confused -and/or- (b) how the author might modify the text to make the connections clear.

3. Are there places where the author should elaborate, clarify, or add more detail? Put an asterisks (*) by these places in the text, and suggest what additions might be appropriate directly on the manuscript. Be as specific as possible about what you feel the paper needs to make it more effective.

4. Are there places where the author needs to back up a claim with a reference or example from the literature? Identify these places by writing "needs reference" -or- "specific example?" (or something along these lines).

5. Is there any information that the author has included that doesn't belong in the paper? Is there any unnecessary detail, inappropriate commentary, examples, or quotations? Circle these spots in the text, and write directly on the manuscript why these parts do not belong.

6. Has the author followed the formatting specifications outlined in the Instructions to Authors? If not, indicate where the formatting needs to be fixed or, if the formatting errors are extensive, refer the author back to the Instructions to Authors.
SUMMARIZE YOUR EDITORIAL COMMENTS BY CLEARLY STATING THE TWO TYPES OF EDITING REVISIONS YOU THINK WOULD MOST IMPROVE THIS MANUSCRIPT BELOW.

a.

b.

COMMENTS ABOUT SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

1. INTRODUCTION:
   • What is the central question addressed in the study? Is this clearly stated in the introduction? If not, suggest ways in which the author can improve the clarity of the study's central question.

   • What useful information does the first paragraph of the introduction provide that leads into the actual study? What information does it lack?

   • What is the rationale or motivation behind the study? Do you, as a reader, feel that you understand the importance and context of the study after reading the introduction?

   • What parts were unnecessary or difficult to understand? Why?

   • Are the studies cited relevant to the study at hand? Are they described at an appropriate level of detail? If not, what additional information do you think is necessary.

   • Does the Introduction accurately reflect what is implied by the title of the paper? If not, point out where the title might be misleading.

   • Overall, how well does the Introduction "flow"? Is it easy to follow? Do all the paragraphs fit together logically and smoothly?
2. RESULTS:

Text:
- Does the text include behavioral as well as numerical results? If not, do you think that including behavioral results would strengthen the paper.

- How effectively does this section guide a reader through the major results? How could the text be made more effective?

- Does the text describe the results themselves or just the figures/tables? In other words, would readers be able to visualize the main trends in the data without consulting the figures?

- What parts are difficult to understand?

Data Presentation:
- Is it easy to absorb the information that each figure and table is trying to present or does a reader have to “work” to absorb the meaning? If not, suggest an alternative way to present the data.

- What statistical tests has the author used to analyze the data? Are these the appropriate statistical tests to use? If you’re not sure, that’s OK but if you even suspect that something is wrong you should point it out and suggest that they see me for advice.

- As a reader, do you think the author emphasizes the biological results or statistic results? This can be evaluated by the wording of sentences and whether or not the statistical results are referred to ONLY parenthetically.

- Can you suggest any additional elements of data analysis that the author could include that would help the author emphasize various points and perhaps improve the overall paper?

- Overall, how well does the Results section "flow"? Is it well organized? Is it easy to follow? Do all the paragraphs fit together logically and smoothly?
4. DISCUSSION:
   • Has the author restated the central question and the main results? If the author has restated the central question as a question, can you suggest a more “sophisticated” (I don’t want to offend anyone but don’t know what other word to use here) construction?

   • Does the discuss cover what was introduced in the introduction and what is implied by the paper’s title? Are all the points discussed relevant for the study at hand? If not, point out where material seems “off topic”.

   • Does the author discuss all of the data presented in the Results section? If not, what is missing?

   • Is there any "fluff"? If yes, where?

   • How effectively does the author compare his/her results to the literature?

   • Overall, how well does the Discussion “flow”? Is it easy to follow? Do all the paragraphs fit together logically and smoothly? Does it follow a logical progression?

5. REFERENCES:
   • Does the author supply a source for all facts that are not common knowledge?

   • Are the references used relevant to and well integrated into the study at hand?

   • Does the format conform to that specified in the Instructions to Authors?
ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS?

WHAT IS ONE QUESTION YOU HAD AS A REVIEWER AS YOU READ THROUGH THE PAPER?

WOULD ANSWERING THIS QUESTION SOMEWHERE IN THE PAPER MAKE THE PAPER MORE EFFECTIVE? IF YES, CAN YOU OFFER ANY SUGGESTIONS?