

MARS 4910 – 1 Fall 2010 Date: _____ Student Name: _____

***Title of Paper Reviewed:* _____**

***Author(s):* _____**

1. Was the research hypothesis (question) clearly stated? Were any assumptions needed to directly relate the research hypothesis / question to the specific experiment / analysis?

2. Did the paper give relevant background information to help the audience understand the rationale and the objectives of the study?

3. Were the methods clearly explained so that the study could be repeated (why / why not)?

4. Did the study make valid comparisons (compare comparable metrics) (why / why not)?

5. Were all the variables (independent, dependent) clearly defined (why / why not)?

6. Were all graphs / tables labeled correctly, and did they clearly explain the results?

7. Did the analyses answer the research hypothesis / question? Did the authors collect data on all relevant variables to answer their question (why / why not)? Can you think of any other factors / variables they did not address?

8. Were the results explained? Did they support or refute the question or hypothesis (why / why not)? Do you agree with the conclusions (why / why not)?

9. Was the paper (organization and style) effective communicating the science?

10. Did the authors discuss any problems in their study and consider what future research might be done to further answer the question (explain)?