

Solutions

2.1

Sixteen volunteers; twelve made at least one relevant revision.

2.2

Clarifies a claim or adds checklist-required support; spelling-only change does not qualify.

2.3

Any three distinct points, B1 each: comments alone were not isolated; the remaining four may have made changes outside the criterion; checklist influence is unknown rather than excluded; one volunteer class does not prove a rule for all classes.

2.4

Any three, B1 each: no checklist-only group; no earlier revision rate; voluntary participation/one class limits wider representation; no later result or suitable assigned comparison.

3.1

Reports revisions after the combined activity; twelve of sixteen and criterion retained; no checklist-only comparison; no isolated comment effect or universal conclusion; proposes a suitable comparison with both groups using the same checklist and pre-stated revision criteria; explains how holding the checklist/criteria consistent addresses the separate-effect question without guaranteeing proof.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate twelve-of-sixteen result; combined checklist/comment activity; relevant-revision criterion and spelling distinction; no invented absence of all changes in remaining four; absent baseline/comparison and no isolated causation; suitable proposed comparison; limited scope without universal benefit or unsupported dismissal; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The seminar reports relevant revisions in twelve of sixteen volunteers after a checklist-and-peer-comment activity. A relevant revision clarified a claim or added required support, so a spelling-only change did not count. The other four did not meet this criterion, but the record does not say they changed nothing. Because everyone received both the checklist and comments, and no earlier revision rate or checklist-only group was recorded, comments alone cannot be identified as the cause. A future comparison could keep the checklist and revision criteria consistent. The evidence is useful but limited; it neither proves a universal benefit nor shows the activity was useless.”