

Peer review is an essential part of modern professional river basin planning and management work. Review allows other colleagues and collaborators to give constructive feedback to the planner or manager 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 report including content, presentation of ideas and information, style, and formatting. In this activity, you will review one preliminary report and provide constructive recommendations and suggestions to improve the report.

Directions:

1. Read the wiki/report 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 draft itself or at the end of the feedback form.
4. Submit your review electronically via Canvas.
5. Also print out a paper copy to give to the author(s).

Wiki/Report Title: _____

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____

Content

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

2. What aspect(s) of the wiki/report did you like most or find most interesting? What was done well?

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

Presentation of Ideas and information

4. Does the abstract summarize the main content and contribution of the wiki/report in one paragraph? If not, what should be added or removed?

5. Is the wiki/report logically organized? If not, how could 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 wiki/report 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 published in peer-reviewed water journals?

Concluding Notes

12. In looking over the Grading Rubric for wikis/reports, are there any other areas that could use improvement that are not addressed in the above questions?
13. What further comments, feedback, or suggestions can you offer the author(s)?