

Solutions

2.1 Section 3; preference cannot answer section 1's accuracy question.

2.2 It concerns cover appearance; it does not check alignment, scoring, ethics or evidence in the proposal.

2.3 Award B1 each for three: decision; reason; actual changed location/version; verification/follow-up status. A blanket "done" without a change is not evidence.

2.4 Decline/defer the memory task because it is outside the agreed question. Remove names and/or correct individual-retrieval promise consistently with anonymity. Recheck question–task–key–analysis or linked anonymity/information sections in the actual revised version.

3.1 Award correction B1 and reason B1 per claim. Record honest decisions and changed locations: version 2 retains errors. Assess measurement alignment and replace preference with the task: effort cannot create accuracy data. Keep teacher approval pending before recruitment: peer feedback has no teacher authorisation power.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: accepts Mei with measurement reason; task/key and linked analysis repair; memory decision with scope reason; name-field repair; truthful retrieval limit; traceable decisions and focused recheck; teacher approval pending before recruitment; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "We accept Mei's correction because the liking survey cannot answer our accuracy question. We will replace section 3 with the sorting task and fixed key, then update the analysis section. We will decline the extra memory competition because it adds an outcome outside the agreed question. To retain anonymity, we will remove the name field and correct the promise about retrieving individual submitted sheets. Our response log will identify decisions, reasons and changed locations, rather than mark unchanged text done. We will ask peers to recheck the linked sections in the revised version. Teacher approval remains pending before recruitment."