

WEBS6203 Peer review process and structure

Overview

The purpose of the peer review is for you to act as a critical friend.

Two pairs of eyes and two brains are definitely better than one.

A critical friend can tell you what is particularly good about your work, and explain to you, how

You can choose how to do the peer review, you may find it helpful just to be in the same room together, and follow the workflow, or you may prefer to fit in the reviewing to your own individual schedule and then meet face to face or virtually to provide feedback to each other.

Workflow

1.	Read through the assignment specification (download it via the handin link)) to make sure that you understand the objectives
2.	Read the paper as a whole
3.	Think about the paper, jot down notes or thoughts
4.	Reread the paper to check out your impression
5.	Work through the feedback grid, check against the paper to confirm your selection, selections may overlap more than one section
6.	Move on to written feedback which is more specific
7.	Write a brief summary to check that you understand the paper– couple of sentences – guidelines in notes section
8.	Use the marking form writing bullet notes
9.	Provide general notes which elaborate any issues you identified
10.	Find a time to sit down with your partner and discuss the paper face to face virtually, whatever you do talking is usually better than just a written summary

Notes

Note for point 7

Write a short summary explaining what the report is about...

e.g. “This report addresses the web science question of how can we take a web science approach to better understand the online market for pharmaceutical drugs. It analyses this from the dual perspectives of psychology and sociology”.

You might go on to elaborate commenting on:

- the sub-fields or specialisms within the chosen disciplines
- the methods and methodologies which have been selected and compared

Note for point 8

Use the criteria to help you think about how to provide feedback

Read carefully, make an effort to understand what the writer is saying

Note for point 9

Provide general comments

- Could you understand what the paper was saying from what they wrote?
- What small changes would make the biggest improvements?
- Provide constructive criticism
- Not only of technical issues, but also organization and clarity.
- Are there things you wanted to see?
- Quality argumentation?
- Quality of writing?
- A manageable number of references?
- table of typos and grammatical errors, and minor textual problems.

Note for point 10

- Take turns, go through the feedback point by point, writer, listen to the feedback and then discuss whether you agree or not, and then both discuss how you might change things.
 - You (the writer) may not have an immediate answer or solution, that is OK
- If you (the reviewer) had trouble understanding parts of the paper, try to explain your difficulties to your partner.
 - Give them an opportunity to try to explain in their own words what they were trying to say or do