Academic writing:  
Draft review form

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: |  |
| Author(s): |  |
| Reviewer: |  |
| Date completed: |  |

This form follows the IMRAD structure. If the draft paper currently reviewed does not follow this structure, match the parts of the paper to the corresponding questions below. Provide comments to the author(s) on the different sections of the paper.

Download the latest version: <http://www.mejtoft.se/thomas/documents/draft-review-form/>

# A. Structure and sections of the paper

## Title

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **title** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How does the title correspond to the **content** of the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Does the title correspond to the content of the paper and the results? |

## Abstract

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **abstract** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How does the abstract give a good summary of the **content** of the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., What should be included or removed from the abstract? |

## Introduction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **introduction** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How is the **funnel technique** used to gradually narrow down the focus of the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |     How are **references** used to support the introduction of the problem in the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Does the introduction introduce the objective? Does it follow a funnel approach? Is the introduction well written? |

## Aim and objective

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **objective** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   Is the objective **specific**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Definitely not | Probably not | Possibly | Probably | Definitely |  | N/A |   Is the objective **measurable**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Definitely not | Probably not | Possibly | Probably | Definitely |  | N/A |   Is the objective **relevant** for the discipline?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Definitely not | Probably not | Possibly | Probably | Definitely |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Is the objective relevant and well written? Is the objective a higher order objective according to e.g., Blooms taxonomy? Is the objective measurable? |

## Theory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **theory** section is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How are **references** used to support the theories discussed?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Is the theory relevant and well written? Are there important theories missing? Have some important theoretical point been left out in order to influence the readers’ opinions? |

## Method

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **method** section is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How are **references** used to support the use of methods?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How does the method section relate to the **objective**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How does the method section relate to the **results**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Is the method well motivated and is all method used in the paper declared? Can the study be repeated by reading the method? |

## Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **results** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How is the **quality** of the results perceived?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |   How does the results section relate to the **objective**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Are the results objective without the opinions of the author? |

## Discussion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **discussion** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How does the discussion section relate to the **results**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How does the discussion section relate to the **theory**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How does the discussion **link** the results and the theory?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How are **references** used to support the link between theory-results-discussion?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How is the **validity** of the work discussed in the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How is the **reliability** of the work discussed in the paper?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Are the results discussed? Are there theoretical connections that justify the use of theories written? |

## Conclusions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of the **conclusions** is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How does the conclusions section relate to the **objective**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   How does the conclusions section relate to the **results** and **discussion**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |     Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Are the conclusions concise and easy to understand? Do the conclusions contribute to new knowledge? |

## References

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do all references in the text appear in the section with the **reference list** and vice versa?   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes | No |  | N/A |   Missing references:  How do the **references** comply with the guidelines/template?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Is there missing information in any of the references? (e.g. author, year, journal, url etc.)   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes | No |  | N/A |   Missing information:  e.g., Is there information missing that is needed in any of the references that make the references deviate from the template or make it hard for the reader to find the sources?  Comments and suggestions on this section:  e.g., Are any important literature sources missing that should be used in this paper? |

## Other sections used (e.g., Acknowledgement, Background etc.) (copy this section and write individual comments for different sections if needed)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The state of this section is:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not started | Outline | Draft | Close to finished | Finished |  | N/A |   How is the **quality** of this section perceived?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this section: |

# B. Style issues

## Guidelines/template

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is the appropriate **guidelines/template** used?   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes | No |  | N/A |   How well does the paper conform to the **guidelines/template**?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this issue: |

## Language and grammar?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How is the **language/grammar** of the paper perceived?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |   Is the appropriate **tense** used in each section?   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes | No |  | N/A |   Comments and suggestions on this issue: |

# C. General comments

## General comments on the paper, not mentioned above?

|  |
| --- |
| Comments and suggestions: |