

peer review guidelines: the prospectus

GEN 411
(Erion)

Below are some questions to consider as you begin 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 prospectus, it is probably worth attending to.

(1) Review the *research questions*; are they *clear* and *carefully written*? Are they presented in a *logical order*? Are they *too broad*? *too focused*? *Should any be removed* (perhaps because they are redundant or off-topic)? Are there *related questions* that might be *missing* from the list?

(2) *Is the thesis clearly stated, and clearly connected to the research questions*? Does it seem *substantial and important*, or no?

(3) The *outline* is a crucial component of the prospectus; is it *clear* and *well organized*? Does it include an *introduction*? a *conclusion*? Are there any other parts that are *missing*? Are there any that should be *removed*? *Can you see the connections between the research questions, the thesis, and the outline*?

(4) After reading the titles, authors, and publications of the works contained in the *bibliography*, does it seem like there is a *good match between the research questions, the thesis, the outline, and the bibliography*? What are the bibliography's *strengths*? its *weaknesses*? (Watch out for biased sources, overreliance on Internet sources, etc.)

(5) Return to the *working title*; given what you now know of the paper's research questions, outline, etc., *does the title seem appropriate*? Is it *too vague*? *too precise*? Does it make the paper sound like it will be *interesting and worth reading*, or no?