Peer reviewing is an important process in science. This provides checks and balances to provide the most accurate/cogent information. Peers evaluate the works of others in a confidential manner so that authors would know how their work is received by the larger community or experts.

1 Review the content
Review the organization and information:
Is there an introduction?
Is the background present, and sufficient to understand the topic?
Is the body of the text presented at an adequate level?
Are the arguments in the text persuasive?
Are the facts, interpretations, and arguments clearly presented?
Is the level of presentation adequate, below expectation or overwhelming?
Are there any problems in understanding the writing, if yes, explain fully.
Ex. Do not say that a paper is disorganized, but suggest the introduction should come first, and some examples given in the text should be moved to the background etc.,
What suggestions can you make to improve the communication?
Are there numerical errors or factual errors?
Do you understand what the writer intended or does the writing deviate from that?
Are there needless repetitions, if yes point them out?
Do you disagree with the writer on specific issues, if yes, explain why and provide citations.
Are there logical errors, if yes, correct them?
Are there changes that you can recommend? If yes, explain the changes and the basis for the changes.
Can you find positive aspects of the draft? If yes, say them in an encouraging, supportive manner.
For example, the writer may be unhappy by reading your comments, and even a small appreciation from you will go a long way.
Have you looked through the draft a second time to find good things to say?

2. Style/Structure
Is there a title? Is there author’s name on it?
Are there adequate graphics?
Are the graphics well illustrated and pertinent?
Are there equations that are numbered consequently?
Are there appropriate, clear, and concise captions to all figures?
Do the figures follow the same general format or the format is being changed midstream?
Are there transitions at appropriate locations and between paras? Is the writing style, flowery? If yes, make alternate suggestions.
Are the sentences too long (>2 lines) or too short (<0.5 lines)? Are the paragraphs too long (>0.5 pages) or too short (<4 lines)?
Are the paragraphs arranged properly, and interconnected (links)?
Are the figures, tables, and charts discussed in the text, adequately?
Are the tables properly organized and less difficult to understand?
Are all the figures, tables, and charts necessary to understand or some can be omitted?
Is the topic too brief, too wide or not interesting?
Is there enough material, length or number of words as required?
Did the author acknowledge the work of others in the area?
Are there adequate citations for the current article and further readings?
Are the citations in the correct format?
Are there excessive number of citations? If yes, how could they be reduced?
Is there a recent review article which cites a large chunk of citations that can be replaced by the review article?
Are all the names of the authors, journal names, and books properly cited?
Does the conclusions section contain data analysis or conclusions?
Finally, evaluate how well the draft covers the topic, overall.

3 Sentence structure and grammar (important, and these problems distract the reader. Remember ‘death by thousand cuts’)
Are there grammatically incorrect sentences? If yes point them out.
Are there too many clauses in a given sentence?
Are commas missing where required (these usually occur in pairs in a given sentence)?
Are there spelling mistakes?
Are the words used properly?
Are the words used economically? (Word economy)
Are there redundancies that can be removed without losing the clarity?
Now convey your evaluations of the draft (not the writer), in 200 words.