

Responding to comments of reviewers

NCVER follow a process of putting the completed papers out for review.

Conference and Journals follow a similar process. The editor makes an initial decision that the paper is worthy of review. If so, the paper is out for review.

Reviews and examination of thesis are similar in that the reviewers indicate through the editor if the draft paper is worthy and usually ask for no correction, minor correction, or major additions before it can be reviewed again and then published.

When you receive reviewers comments read and then put them down and wait a day before reading again. Criticism of your own work is often difficult to take! Accept that the reviewers are being helpful and their suggestions will make your paper better than before. It is not just what you intend – it is what others read!

REVIEWER'S REPORT ON DRAFT PAPERS

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Title of paper: | |
| Author/s: | |
| Date of review: | |

Notes for Reviewer

- The Communities of Practice participants are novice researchers who have received funding (\$4 000) from NCVER to investigate a workplace issue. They have learnt about research techniques through collaborative activities with experts, peers and mentors. Their research will be published as "Occasional papers".
- We are looking for constructive criticism to improve the paper. Please ensure that your comments are able to be fed directly back to the researcher/s.
- Your comments will remain anonymous
- Areas to focus your attention to:
 - interest to audiences
 - plain English writing (not too academic or containing too much jargon)
 - logical flow and argument

- data analysis – is it sound?
- validity of findings
- conclusions are based on the evidence presented

NCVER COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE
Peer reviewer's report – Research papers
Draft papers

Please ensure that your comments are constructive and able to be fed directly back to the researcher(s).

1. Comments on the title

Reviewer comments

2. Please use the following criteria to assist with your review, rating the report using a 5 point scale (1 being poor/no and 5 being excellent/yes).

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ❖ Is the aim of the research clearly stated? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Is a suitable context for the research provided? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Does the research address the research questions? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Is the research methodologically sound? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Does the report need further explanation of the methodology, or limitations of the methodology? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Are the findings clearly identified and valid? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Is the information in the report structured logically? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ❖ Is the report written in clear, direct, plain English? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Reviewer comments/clarification in relation to the above assessment

I think the researcher has.....

3. Please comment on the substance of the paper, including any major areas of weakness and any aspects which could be addressed to improve the paper.

Reviewer comments

. The researcher has

4. Any further comments on the paper?

Reviewer comments

I think the researcher has

Support documents (where relevant)

Support documents provide additional information and are supplementary to the main report.

1. Do you have any general comments about the support documents?

Reviewer comments

[Researcher response to reviewer's comments](#)

Researcher response