ABT 301
Criteria for Research Proposal Peer Reviews

General Instructions

Each student is required to review the written draft research proposal of two other students. The purpose of these peer reviews is to provide the proposal writer with constructive suggestions for improving the draft before submittal of the final version.

Please provide **two (2) hard-copies** of *each* of your reviews so that one copy can be given directly to the Principal Investigator (writer of the proposal), and the other to the instructor for grading.

All reviews are due at the beginning of class on the date indicated in the class Syllabus.

**You must _also_ submit the two reviews <u>electronically</u> (as MS-Word files)
prior to the submission deadline by sending the files to the appropriate instructor.**

**You must _also_ return the two student proposals
with corrections/suggestions made legibly in pencil by the submission deadline date.**

Specific Instructions

Please provide a *detailed* review of between 500 and 1,000 words for the proposal, addressing the questions listed below. Your review should be written in such a way that if specific deficiencies are found in the proposal, **you offer specific suggestions for improvement.** Please also comment **on any specific areas where the proposal is well-written.** In order to maintain a professional and objective perspective, do not refer to the proposal writer's name in your comments; rather, refer to them as the 'principal investigator'. All reviews should be written using complete sentences and full paragraphs.

Reviews should be type-written, single or one and one-half spaced, 12 point font, and 1" margins on all sides.

Each of your reviews should contain the following information at the **top of the first page**:

<p style="text-align:center;">**Reviewer's (your) name**
Date of Review
Proposal Title
Principal Investigator (i. e., author of proposal)</p>

Follow this header with a *detailed* review specifically addressing *all* of the following areas. *Please use these as sub-headings in your review documents.*

1. **HYPOTHESIS/GOAL**: Based on your reading of the proposal, what is the central hypothesis or goal of the project? Use your own words and paraphrase. The review should note if the proposal does not make this point clear.

2. **RELEVANCE**: Based on your reading of the proposal, why is it important to society and the scientific community for the hypothesis to be tested or the goal achieved? The review should note if the proposal does not make this point clear.

3. **BACKGROUND**: To what extent did the Principal Investigator describe and demonstrate knowledge of the system under study and background literature? Is adequate information provided that the reader understands the basic area of research and has the information needed to understand the proposed experiments?

4. **METHODS**: Were the experiments, approaches, and techniques adequately described and documented to indicate their feasibility?

5. **ANTICIPATED RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION**: Were the expected results described in such a way that they can be related back to the hypothesis and/or goals? Was adequate information provided describing any data manipulation that will be performed (e. g., statistical analyses, bioinformatics, etc.)?

6. **LIMITATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES**: Were potential limitations related to experimental design, techniques, and resources described? Were possible alternative approaches adequately explained?

7. **TIMETABLE**: Was a detailed timetable provided for performing the project?

8. **FORMAT**: Did the proposal format adhere to requirements for ABT proposals?

9. **SUMMARY**: Provide a general written summary of your evaluation of the quality of the proposal.

In addition, also provide a checked rank based on the following categories:

Outstanding (must support)   _____
Excellent (high priority for support)   _____
Good (medium priority for support)   _____
Fair (low priority for support)   _____
Poor (must not support)   _____

***In addition*, you are expected to <u>carefully</u> <u>edit</u> the entire proposal and provide hand-written comments directly on the proposals related to grammar, syntax, typographical errors, specific questions, etc.**