

## Manuscript Paired Peer Critique Guide

This guide is meant to help a peer evaluator of a manuscript give strong and helpful feedback to the author. Before you submit a manuscript, ask a peer to read your manuscript and go through the questions in this guide with you.

### General

Evaluator: Read the author's entire outline/paper, and then describe their paper back to them in four sentences: What they sought to do, what they did, what they found, what it means. Can you do this? Did you get it right? Discuss your description with the author. Address with them issues of clarity in their story.

Then, ask the following general questions of the author:

1. How would/did you decide when to write this up?
2. Who is your audience? What do you think is the "impact" of your paper?
3. What journal would you submit this paper to? Why? How did you decide?
4. Was your record keeping good? Did you have a good handle on planned versus post hoc hypotheses and analyses? Can you easily retrieve information on sample descriptives, attrition, methods details, etc.?

### Introduction

Evaluator: Evaluate the introduction with respect to the following and discuss with author:

- ☐ Context of research question is well developed
- ☐ Gap in literature that the paper addresses is clear
- ☐ Hypotheses are clearly stated
- ☐ Methodological choices are justified by context

Are there gaps in the framing? How would you address these?

Then, ask the following questions of the author:

1. How did you conduct your literature review? How did you ensure that all relevant literature was included?
2. How did you come up with your study idea? How do you represent the justification for your study in your introduction? Does it track with your original goals for the research?
3. Do you preview your main findings? Why/why not?
4. If reporting on multiple studies/analyses, do you present them in the order they were conducted? Why/why not?

### Methods

Evaluator: Evaluate the methods with respect to the following and discuss with author:

- ☐ Critical information needed to evaluate method is included (within reason given format)
- ☐ Reporting of participants is thorough
- ☐ Reasonable effort is made to address validity, reliability, and bias issues
- ☐ All relevant IVs and DVs are reported
- ☐ Coding schemes, if relevant, are disclosed and clear
- ☐ Reporting of measures allows the reader to make clear predictions about the analyses they will conduct

Then, ask the following questions of the author:

1. Do you feel confident that you can clearly describe your methods so that your paper can be evaluated and/or replicated?
2. How could you make use of supplementary materials to make reporting clearer?
3. How would you use figures to support your methods descriptions, if applicable?
4. Did you make any design decisions that you regret? How did you deal with this in your paper?
5. Did you follow your stated design faithfully? For example, if you said subjects were randomly assigned, were they always? Common deviations include pseudo-random distribution keeping sex/age relatively equal between groups. What deviations were there, if any? How would you report these?

## Results

Evaluator: Evaluate the results with respect to the following and discuss with author:

- ☐ All relevant (planned or completed) comparisons are reported (within reason given format)
- ☐ Analyses or analysis plan follows logically from methods
- ☐ Hypotheses are tested.
- ☐ Confirmatory/primary and exploratory/secondary analyses are clearly delineated, if applicable
- ☐ Statistical tests used are appropriate for methods

Then, ask the following questions of the author:

1. Did you fully disclose *all* comparisons and analyses (even those that did not “work out”)?
2. Did you ensure that you chose the correct statistical tests? How would you justify their use in your manuscript?
3. How would you use figures/tables to support your results descriptions, if applicable?
4. How could you make use of supplementary materials to make reporting clearer?

## Discussion

Evaluator: Evaluate the discussion with respect to the following and discuss with author:

- ☐ Purpose and hypotheses are clearly restated
- ☐ Results are represented with integrity and conclusions follow from the results
- ☐ Limitations are discussed, validity is addressed
- ☐ Future directions make sense in the scope of the paper. That is, future directions follow logically from the results and inform the question at hand, as opposed to being just a collection of potential future studies that one could do.

Then, ask the following questions of the author:

1. What do you believe are the limitations of your study?
2. What do you think a reviewer would be most likely to take issue with? What steps could you take to address that ahead of time?
3. What did you struggle most with when thinking about writing this paper up?
4. What do you feel most confident about with respect to writing up your work?
5. What are your biggest concerns about writing up your work?