Assignment 3: being the "expert"

Due: **Friday, April 8, 2022**

Find a primary scientific paper in a peer-reviewed journal (ideally one in the discipline that you work) and pretend you have been asked to review that paper as the methods/statistics expert.

- The paper you choose must be an empirical paper containing analyses of raw data (not a theory paper, a review paper, or opinion piece and ideally not a meta-analysis, as those methods tend to be very difficult to review). You will likely need to look through several papers before finding one that you feel could be improved; you don't want your review to simply state "Everything looks great!" Most papers seem well done on a first quick read through but many start to come apart when you dig deeper into the details.
- Your review should be no more than three pages, double spaced.
- It is ok to write in paragraph form or to use bullet points to list your different concerns.
- If appropriate, it may make sense to separate your concerns in to "Major concerns" and "Minor concerns." For example, an inappropriate method, which could lead to spurious conclusions, would be a "major concern," whereas, a poorly presented figure (which likely has no impact on the overall conclusions) would typically be a "minor concern."
- You should seek to find a paper with sufficient methodological detail to enable a clear review. Of course, missing methodological details are also points that should be raised in a review.
- Begin your review with a short 3-5 sentence summary of the goals of the paper and your overall perception of whether the paper accomplished those goals.

Email your assignment (as a pdf), as well as the paper you are reviewing, to lmgonigl@sfu.ca with filename: LASTNAME_FIRSTNAME_ASSIGNMENT3.pdf

Rubric

1. Quality of critique [**8 points**]
    - Have you identified potential problems?
    - Are the identified concerns valid?
2. Quality of presentation and clarity of writing [**2 points**]
    - Clear written style and logical organization of the review.