For your peer reviews, please use the rubric provided (it is the same as the rubric on the last page of the project assignment).

You should

* Given the author full marks in every category of the rubric (these points won’t count toward the author’s grade, so you could actually do anything, but giving them a high score is a nice thing to do)
* In each category of the rubric, try to say something about
  + Something specific that you like about what the author has done in that category
  + Something specific about an improvement the author could make, to make that category even better

If you really can’t think of anything, you can just say “I can’t think of any improvements!” or something like that.

More generally you should

* Be Professional
* Be Pleasant (even when telling the author about something they could improve)
* \*\*\* Be Helpful \*\*\*
* Be Scientific
* Be Realistic
* Be Empathetic
* Be Organized

Finally, don’t overwhelm the author with tons and tons of comments in each category of the rubric.  A limited number of well-chosen comments that the author can really understand to help them improve their paper, is better than a blizzard of comments that the author will never get all the way through.

If you find it easier to write out your comments in MSWORD or something and then upload them as a pdf, that’s fine.  But if you do this, you should still make sure you say the two things above about every rubric category, since that is how I will know you did a complete review.

You might also find the guidance here helpful: <https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/technicalwriting/chapter/appendix-h-peer-review-essentials/>

I plan to give everyone 33 pts for each completed review, plus 1 extra point for an even 100 points.  If one of your reviews feels really incomplete to me, you may get less than 33 points on that review.

All best,

-BJ