English 2Spring 2017Peer Review Worksheet**: Annotated Bibliography**   
  
Writer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   
for the writer:   
  
1**. *If you didn’t include an introduction****,* briefly identify your **topic, the essay you’re refuting**, **your grounds for refuting it,** your **specific audience,** and **forum** for the researched argument. (Write on the back if you need more room.)

2. What in particular do you want the reviewer to check? (Be specific.)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   
1. If there an **introductory paragraph,** does it briefly explain the topic, the essay you’re refuting, your grounds for refuting it, the specific audience, and forum for the researched argument? \_\_\_ How are the research questions? Is this section clear and thorough enough? How might it be improved?

2. Are the citations themselves **properly formatted using MLA style?** Point out any problems you notice on the draft itself (e.g. not alphabetized, indented wrong, or no dates given for web access).

3. Do the sources look **relevant, recent, reputable**, and **varied** enough (that is, not *all* web sites or *all* scholarly journals)? You might need to discuss the sources with the writer a bit to determine the relevance & variety issue.

4. Does each **annotation include all three sections**: summary, evaluation of the source’s credibility and quality, and a brief explanation of how the source will fit into the writer’s researched argument? Point out on the draft itself any annotations that have missing pieces.

5. The **summary** section of each annotation should be the lengthiest part. For each one, check to see that there are **enough specific details** to convey the crux of the piece: not just a summary of the topics it covers, but what it says *about* the topic, especially the key data and conclusions. If wordiness is a problem, suggest ways (on the draft itself) that it could be more concise and thus meatier. (For example, cross out any information that would be obvious from the citation, e.g. where the article was published.)

6. Is there at least one source that represents an **alternative view**? That is, if most of the sources are *for* self-driving cars, is there at least one to address the drawbacks? (Remember, there must be at least one alternative view quoted in the final paper, too.)

7. **Plagiarism check**: from what you can tell, are the annotations in the student’s own words, or are there any parts that sound odd or too jargon-laden? Note on the draft any passages that might be problematic.

8. What did you find most interesting or impressive about this draft?