ADI Investigation Report Peer Review Guide-TGB version

Reviewed by	Reviewed by	Reviewed	by				
YOU MUST ADDRESS	Section 1: Introduction and Guiding Question			Reviewer Rating			
THE FOLLOWING WORDS AND CONCEPTS IN YOUR INTRODUCTION:	Is there enough background information and is it accurate?		□No	☐ Partially	□Ye		
	Is the guiding question explicit and did the author EXPLAIN HOW the		□No	☐ Partially	□Ye		
	question is related to the background information? Reviewers: EXPLAIN HOW the author could Author: What revisi						
errors, statistically signification, Chi square value, degrees of freedom, p-value, Trivers-Willard hypothesis							
Section 2: Meth	ection 2: Method				Reviewer Rating		
Did the author describe the procedures and EXPLAIN WHY the procedures were used?			□No	☐ Partially	☐ Ye		
Did the author describe what data were collected and EXPLAIN WHY the data were collected? Reviewers: EXPLAIN HOW the author could improve this part Author: What revisions did you			□No	☐ Partially	□ Ye		
of his or her report.							

Section 3: The Argument			Reviewer Rating			
Did the author make a claim consistent with the evidence that answers the guiding question?			□No	☐ Partially	□Yes	
Quality of Evidence	Did the author describe how he/she and	alyzed the data and EXPLAIN	ПМо	□ Dortiolly	□Vos	
	WHY the analysis helped him/her answer the guiding question?		□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
	Is the analysis of the data appropriate a	Is the analysis of the data appropriate and free from errors?		☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
	Is the author's interpretation of the ana	llysis valid?	□ No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
	MANDATORY DATA: Chi square statistic	c, p-value	□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
	Are tables and graphs correctly formatted, labeled, and are metric units		□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
Presentation of	sed?			□ Partially	□ res	
Evidence	Are specific values from tables and graphs referenced in the body of the		□No	☐ Partially	□Yes	
	text?					
	Did the author state WHAT scientific concept is being defended?		□No	□ Partially	☐ Yes	
Justification of	Did the author DESCRIBE the data from their analysis used as evidence		□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
Evidence	in support of the scientific concept? Did the author EXPLAIN HOW the evidence supports the underlying					
	scientific concept?		□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
Did the author FYDI A	IN HOW his or her claim agrees with the o	claims made by other groups and				
PROVIDE REASONS for	=	ciamis made by other groups and	□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
	HOW the author could improve this part	Author: What revisions did you r	nake in y	our report?		
of his or her report.						
			1			
Mechanics				Reviewer Rating		
Organization: Is each section easy to follow? Do paragraphs include multiple sentences: Do			□No	☐ Partially	□Yes	
paragraphs begin with a topic sentence?				□ Faitially	□ 1€3	
Grammar: Are the sentences complete? Is there proper subject-verb agreement in each			□No	☐ Partially	☐ Yes	
sentence? Are there run-on sentences?						
Conventions: Did the author use appropriate spelling, punctuation, paragraphing and			□No	☐ Partially	□Yes	
capitalization: Word Choice: Did the author use the appropriate words (e.g. there us their to us too than us			1	,	1	
Word Choice: Did the author use the appropriate words (e.g., there vs. their, to vs. too, than vs. then, etc.)?			□No	☐ Partially	□Yes	
Fluency: Does the paper as a whole flow well? Do the sections follow each other to give a						
complete idea of the lab?				☐ Partially	⊠ Yes	