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This activity accompanies the article ‘[Check my working](rsc.li/2tBSMXI)’. Read the article and then use this set of questions to evaluate your partner’s experimental write-up and provide some constructive feedback.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author’s name: [Your partner’s name]**  **Reviewer’s name: [Your name]** | **Reviewer rating** | | |
| **Yes** | **In part** | **No** |
| **Introduction** | | | |
| Did the author provide accurate and sufficient background information about the study? |  |  |  |
| Did the author clearly state the aim of the experiment? |  |  |  |
| **Method** | | | |
| Is the method explained well enough so that someone else could repeat it and know what to do? |  |  |  |
| Has the author used the correct terminology? |  |  |  |
| **Results** | | | |
| Have the results been presented clearly and in an appropriate format (eg in a table and/or using graphs or diagrams)? |  |  |  |
| **Conclusion** | | | |
| Do the results support the conclusion? |  |  |  |
| Has the author discussed how well their data fits with that of others’? |  |  |  |
| **If you have rated any section ‘no’ or ‘in part’, explain how the author might improve their work.** | | | |
|  | | | |