**Research Report: First Rough Draft/Peer Review**

Here’s a brief lay-out of the sections of the report; use it as a guide for peer review and to see what you need to finish up for your final draft. Obviously not all of these sections will be done, so just check what you can.

**BODY OF REPORT**

Introduction See if each section answers these questions.

What is the subject of the paper? (ideally you can lift & revise this from your proposal or progress report)

What is the purpose of the argument?

* Present info to enable readers to understand a subject?
* Persuade/affect readers’ attitude towards a subject?

What is the background of the topic that readers need to know? (same here: can you revise what you have?)

I regularly ask students the expand the context of the paper to make clear its significance, why it matters. How can the project be “reframed” if necessary to bolster our understanding of why it is important beyond the initial description?

What is the scope of the paper? (topics to be covered as well as topics that are not)

What are the most significant findings (conclusion drawn?) and/or what are the recommendations?

Methods: What was done? How did the writer gather information? *List a few methods.*

Results: What was found? Are any results given yet? *Try to summarize.*

Conclusion: Based on was found, what does all of this mean? What conclusions can one draw? *Can you come to a different conclusion than the one your peer did?*

Recommendations: And based on those conclusion, what are the recommendations? What needs to be added? How can these be expanded to link to a broader idea of significance? Conversely, what should be cut?

What secondary sources can you recommend to bolster the argument? What kind of evidence would support an expansion (if needed) of the significance of the topic? Where, when you were reading, did you say “where’s your proof of that?”

Are secondary sources adequately incorporated? Do you suspect unclear use of sources? Mark in the text!

Review coherence guidelines (Ch. 6)

* Title and subheadings written effectively
* Lists done effectively: can anything be turned into a list? Are there too many lists?
* Paragraphs written effectively —check esp. on paragraph length and dividing paragraphs

Are there any graphics included? Note places where some information might be turned into a figure or table.

Are they appropriate kinds?

Referred to in the text?

Properly sourced?

Do they add to the argument?

**FRONT AND BACK MATTER**

Check any completed front matter, format and content

* Cover/title page
* Abstract (note: this probably isn’t done yet since it is an informative abstract)
* Table of Contents and List of Table and Figures (do they match the proposal?)

Check any completed back matter, format and content:

* List of References
* Glossary / Appendixes (if appropriate)

**LOOK AT DESIGN:** Check headings, pagination, color, fonts. What works? Where does report design falter?