

Research Paper Peer Review Guide (ENC 1101)

Reviewer:

Author:

PART ONE: In-text citations check

DIRECTIONS: First, using your highlighter, highlight the *in-text citations* within the rough draft itself. That means highlight both the *parenthetical citations* AND the *introductory citations (introductory credit)*.

When you've finished highlighting the in-text citations, see if you can QUICKLY find those sources on the author's **WORKS CITED** page. If you can't find a particular source on the WC page right away, it means either one of two things:

1. The author did not correctly format the entry on the Works Cited page.
2. The author did not correctly format the in-text citation.

REMEMBER: The first item of that entry on the WORKS CITED page is what is credited within the paper (in parentheses at the end of a passage or in an introductory citation), whether it's a title or an author's last name. The reader should be able to *quickly* match the in-text citation with the entry on the WC page.

Also, scan the Works Cited page, and compare it to the example Works Cited page in the research paper packet (last page). Are there any noticeable differences? What are they?

PART TWO: Draft overview

Answer the following:

1. What does the author use as a HOOK (attention-grabber)? Is it actually enticing to you?

2. What is the thesis statement of the paper?

3. List the MAIN IDEAS of the body of the paper. (Do they follow the thesis' pattern of organization?)

4. How does the author **SUPPORT** each of the main ideas?

5. Does the author use appropriate **TRANSITIONS** and/or linking sentences/passages to ^{move} ~~move~~ the reader from one point to the next? Indicate some examples. If there aren't any, please make appropriate suggestions.

6. What, *specifically*, worked well in the paper?

7. What needs improvement? Is there anything about the paper that is unclear or irrelevant to the thesis? Is it clear and cohesive? Does it flow well?