

PEER REVIEW GUIDE

Second Draft Review

Reviewer: _____

Author Reviewed: _____

Paper Title: _____

Date: _____

Purpose of This Review

This is the second peer review of your colleague's paper. Your role is to identify possible issues, and to give precise, constructive guidance that will help them produce a polished final draft. Be specific—vague praise or criticism is rarely useful.

Focus areas for Draft 2:

- Structure & Organization — Does the paper flow logically? Is the architecture of the argument clear?
- Clarity of Writing & Exposition — Is the mathematics or statistics communicated clearly to the intended audience?

1. First Impressions

In 2–3 sentences, summarize what this paper is about in your own words.

What is the single strongest aspect of this draft?

What is the most important thing the author should address before the final draft?

2. Structure & Organization

What to look for:

- Is there a clear introduction that motivates the topic and states the paper's goals?
- Are the sections in a logical order? Does each section follow naturally from the last?
- Is there a conclusion that summarizes results and reflects on significance or open questions?
- Are transitions between sections and ideas smooth and explicit?
- Do definitions, lemmas, theorems, and examples appear at appropriate points—not too early or too late?

Rating	Overall Structure
4	Excellent — The paper's architecture is clear, logical, and easy to navigate throughout.
3	Good — Mostly well-organized; minor issues with transitions or placement of content.
2	Developing — Some sections feel out of place or transitions are abrupt; noticeable reorganization needed.
1	Needs Work — Structure is difficult to follow; major reorganization is needed.

Circle your rating: 4 3 2 1

(NOTE: This is your general score for the paper you're reviewing, I won't use it for the "grade").

Which section is hardest to follow, and why? Be specific about the location and the issue.

Are definitions, theorems, and examples placed at the right point in the paper? Explain any issues.

If you could suggest one structural change, what would it be?

3. Clarity of Writing & Exposition

What to look for:

- Is the intended audience clear, and is the level of exposition appropriate for that audience?
- Are mathematical terms defined before they are used?
- Is mathematical notation used consistently throughout?
- Are sentences grammatically complete and free of mathematical shorthand (e.g., overuse of symbols in place of words)?
- Do examples illuminate the ideas, or do they feel perfunctory?
- Are proofs or arguments written in a way that a reader can follow step by step?

Rating	Clarity & Exposition
4	Excellent — Writing is precise, readable, and well-suited to the audience throughout.
3	Good — Generally clear; a few passages are confusing or inconsistent in notation/terminology.
2	Developing — Multiple sections are difficult to follow; definitions or notation need significant improvement.
1	Needs Work — Writing is unclear throughout; the reader cannot follow the mathematics without major revision.

Circle your rating: 4 3 2 1
(Same note as before)

Find one passage that is particularly unclear. Copy the page/section reference and explain what confused you.

Is the notation consistent throughout the paper? Note any inconsistencies you found.

Are the examples effective? Identify one that works well and one (if any) that could be improved.

5. Final Recommendations

List your top 3 concrete suggestions for the final draft, in priority order.

A note on giving good feedback

- Be specific: cite page numbers, section headings, or line numbers when possible.
- Be constructive: explain why something is unclear, not just that it is.
- Be kind: this is a collegial exercise. The goal is to help, not to judge.
- Be honest: your colleague needs accurate feedback to improve—not just reassurance.

Discuss your results together. At the end of class, give the sheet to the instructor (who will return it promptly).