Peer Reviewer Checklist

Phase 1: The Big Picture (Structural Integrity)

- **The "So What?" Factor:** Is the problem or research question clearly defined in the first two pages? Do I understand why this project matters?
- **Logical Flow:** Does the transition from the introduction to the methodology feel like a natural progression, or is there a "jump" in logic?
- **Alignment:** Does the conclusion (or intended conclusion) actually answer the question posed at the beginning?

Phase 2: Evidence & Rigor

- **Source Quality:** Are the references credible and appropriate for a senior-level project?
- **Data/Evidence Clarity:** If there are charts, code snippets, or case studies, are they explained in the text, or am I left to interpret them myself?
- **Counter-Arguments:** Does the author acknowledge potential limitations or alternative viewpoints, or is the project "one-sided"?

Phase 3: The "User Experience" (Clarity)

- **Jargon Check:** Are technical terms defined for an educated but non-specialist audience?
- **Visual Aids:** Where the text gets dense, would a diagram, table, or photo help me understand the concept faster?
- **The "Clutter" Test:** Are there any paragraphs that feel like "filler" and don't contribute to the core goal?

Rating your Feedback

Criterion	What to Look For	Rating (1-5)
Actionability	Can the author actually *do* something with your suggestion?	
Specificity	Did you point to a specific page, paragraph, or line?	
Objectivity	Is the feedback based on project goals, not personal taste?	
Tone	Is the critique constructive and professional?	