Pretend that you are acting as referee for a journal and write up a peer-review report of The Darden and Grzymala-Busse article.

As background, a referee’s report normally contains the following elements: (1) an overall assessment; (2) a brief summary of the authors’ arguments, to prove that the reviewer understands them; (3) a mention of the article’s strong points; and (4) a critique of its weak points. In practice, as you may discover in the future, (3) is sometimes omitted.

Assessments typically take one of four forms: reject, revise and resubmit (with no guarantee of ultimate acceptance), a favorable revise and resubmit, or publish as is. In practice, very few articles receive a “publish as is”. Assessments are normally conservative, in order to encourage authors to submit their best work the first time around. Thus, an article that has significant problems would normally receive a rejection, even if these problems are potentially fixable.