Written Document Review

Author:
Date:
Title:
Reviewer:

4 - Excellent; document is ready to submit to a peer-review journal or grad college
3 - Acceptable; document is ready to submit to committee for internal review with
     indicated minor revisions, defense may be scheduled
2 - Not acceptable; major indicated revisions required and resubmitted
1 - Poor; extensive revisions required

Category	1	2	3	4
Logic	Unable to determine the point of the paper	Objectives are unclear and/or conclusions are mostly unsupported	Objectives clearly stated and conclusions mostly supported	Objectives clearly stated and conclusions very well supported
Analysis	Data analysis not described or grossly errant	Analysis may not be appropriate or is incorrectly implemented and described	Analysis is largely appropriate and correctly implemented (interpretation unlikely to change)	Analysis is appropriate and correctly described and implemented
Readability	Confusing, unable to follow the point of the paper	May be verbose, ambiguous, and/or contain confusing phrasing and word choice	Mostly clear, concise and accurate, few confusing phrases or word choices	Very easy for the reader to follow the points of the paper, "tells the story"
Grammar	Numerous misspellings & grammar errors - unreadable	Misspellings, punctuation, language errors distract from readability	Grammar errors are minor and not distracting	Very few noticeable grammar errors
Format	Format very inconsistent and not representative of journal style	Format mostly consistent but doesn't meet journal style	Mostly meets journal style with minor revisions	Meets JAS or AAS format (abbreviations, citations, numerals, figures etc.)