

peer review guidelines: the rough draft

GEN 411
(Erion)

Below are some questions to consider as you continue the peer review process; remember that GEN 411 authors should write for an intelligent (but not necessarily expert) audience, so if you or your peers have trouble understanding any part of a draft, it is probably worth attending to.

- (1) Before you begin reading the draft, remind yourself of *where it fits into the overall structure* of the paper. Are there clear *transitions* from what will come before it in the finished piece, and to what will come after it? Also, are there *section headings* to clearly distinguish the major parts of the paper? (These are relatively simple, but important, issues; many GEN 411 authors have trouble linking the various parts of their papers together in clear, logical ways that readers can easily follow.)

- (2) As you read the draft, bracket any sections that you are having trouble understanding. Try to determine *why* you are struggling with these sections; do they have *grammatical or mechanical problems*? Do they exhibit some *stylistic awkwardness* that can be improved upon? Do they seem *out of place*, or do they have other (perhaps internal) *organizational issues*? Are there *technical terms* that need to be defined? Are there assertions that need *more evidence* to justify them, or that are otherwise questionable?

(3) *Have sources been cited* in proper MLA or APA format? Do there seem to be *too many* citations? *too few* citations? If there is a *Works Cited* or *References* section in the draft, is it properly constructed?

(4) Before you finish, ask yourself again how the draft fits into the overall plan for the finished paper. Can you now see how the paper's *overall argument* will unfold? *Have you been able to follow the argument contained in the draft?* Do you find the argument *convincing* at this stage? *Why or why not?*