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# Peer Review Evaluation

**Directions:** Complete the following review sheet for your designated partner. Circle the appropriate numbers and provide two pieces of feedback at the bottom of the page.

5 – Well above grade level/standard; truly exemplary work going above and beyond expectations

4 – Above average grade level/standard output; a good effort has been given

3 – At grade level/standard; standards have been met at minimum capacity

2 – Slightly below grade level/standard expectations; a stronger effort or remedial efforts and instruction may be needed

1 – Well below grade level/standard expectations; low effort has been given, or remedial instruction is needed, as the content at this point is proving too difficult

# Overall Summary (will be shared with the authors)

In your own words, please summarize the content and purpose of the article:

The key message for readers was:

Is there additional information or clarification needed?

Major issues or concerns (Please describe):

Minor issues or concerns (Please describe):

# Importance

Does the article add significant knowledge to the body of literature? Is about a novel procedure, condition, or treatment? Does it contain important information not currently available? (5 = Highly Important/Novel; 1 = No importance/novelty)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

# Clarity

Is the article easy to read and understand? (5= It is well written; 4= Minor grammar or punctuation edits needed; 3 = organization/clarity is needed; 2 = The use of a scientific editor should be employed; 1 = the article is not acceptable/reviewable)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

# Accept or Reject

Please select your decision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accept As Is | Major Revision | Minor Revision | Reject |

# Other comments (to Journal Only):