

## Research & Analysis / Academic Research

Critique a draft paper as if you were an anonymous reviewer — strengths, weaknesses, fatal flaws.

Difficulty: Advanced

Model: GPT-4 / Claude / Gemini

Use Case: Pre-Submission Quality Check, Revision Planning, Reviewer Training

Updated: May 2026

Why This Prompt Exists

Desk rejects happen because authors can't see their own blind spots.

You get:

- submitting papers that could have been fixed with one more round
- surprise at reviewer criticisms that seem obvious in hindsight
- wasting months on resubmissions instead of weeks on revisions
- co-authors who are too nice to give honest feedback
- rejection letters that say “methodological concerns” without specifics

But peer review follows patterns:

- contribution: is this new? important? interesting?
- methods: can I trust the findings?
- results: do they support the claims?
- discussion: are limitations acknowledged?
- writing: is it clear and concise?

Without simulation, you submit too early.

This prompt acts as a harsh-but-fair reviewer #2.

## The Prompt

Assume the role of an anonymous peer reviewer known for being thorough and fair but demanding.

Your task is to review a draft paper and recommend accept, revise, or reject.

Generate:

### 1. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

- Accept as is / Minor revisions / Major revisions / Reject
- Confidence level (High/Medium/Low)

### 2. SUMMARY (1 paragraph)

- What the paper claims
- Whether it succeeds

### 3. MAJOR CONCERNS (if reject or major revisions)

- Fatal flaws that undermine conclusions
- Missing analyses or controls
- Overclaims not supported by data

### 4. MINOR CONCERNS (always include)

- Clarity issues
- Missing citations
- Presentation problems

### 5. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR AUTHORS

- What you genuinely want to know

## 6. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR

- Ethical concerns
- Scope fit
- Novelty assessment

### INPUTS:

Paper (abstract + key sections):

[PASTE OR UPLOAD]

Journal target (for fit assessment):

[E.G., "Nature Human Behaviour", "PLOS ONE"]

Your expertise level in this field:

[HIGH / MEDIUM / LOW]

### RULES:

- Be specific – "this analysis is wrong" is less useful than "Table 2 uses a t-test but the design requires repeated-measures ANOVA"
- Distinguish between "must fix" and "nice to fix"
- Flag any ethical concerns (uncredited prior work, data sharing, IRB)
- If recommending rejection, explain what would make it publishable

### How To Use It

- Run this before every submission — fix what the simulator finds before a real reviewer does.
- Use different "personas" (statistical reviewer, theoretical reviewer, methods reviewer).

- Share the output with co-authors as a pre-submission checklist.
- If the simulator recommends “reject,” don’t submit — revise first.
- Use the “questions for authors” to prepare your response letter in advance.

Example Input

**Paper (abstract):**

“We surveyed 50 people about their remote work preferences. Most preferred hybrid. We conclude companies should adopt hybrid policies.”

**Paper (key sections):**

“Methods: Convenience sample of author’s LinkedIn network. 80% response rate. Single question: ‘Do you prefer fully remote, hybrid, or fully office?’ No statistical tests reported. N=50 (32 female, 18 male, mean age 34).”

**Journal target:**

Journal of Management

**Your expertise level in this field:**

HIGH

Why It Works

Most authors review their own papers with rose-colored glasses — reading what they meant to write, not what they wrote.

This framework improves outcomes by forcing:

- clear recommendation (no hedging)
- major vs. minor distinction (prioritization)
- fatal flaw detection (desk reject prevention)
- questions for authors (anticipates reviewer comments)
- editorial assessment (fit and novelty)

Great peer review simulation doesn't flatter — it finds what will get you rejected and helps you fix it first.

## **Build Better AI Systems**

Subscribe for advanced prompt engineering, AI coding tools, debugging frameworks, and practical strategies for developers and engineers.

Carefully engineered prompts for people doing real work.

### **Share this:**

- [Share on Facebook \(Opens in new window\) Facebook](#)
- [Share on X \(Opens in new window\) X](#)

See also [Contradiction Hunter](#)