The purpose of this peer-review workshop is to provide and receive feedback intended to ensure that the content of your colleague’s CV effectively communicates their qualifications and skills. Spend a few minutes reading your partner’s draft, and feel free to ask questions or discuss it as you read.

1. **Is the format consistent and appropriate?**
   1. Is the formatting consistent across and within sections? Is proper AMA citation used for publications? Is the material presented in reverse chronological order?
   2. Can the CV be effectively skimmed in less than 5 minutes? If not, what is distracting or delaying you as a reader?
   3. Is the overall CV readable, well organized, and easy to understand?
2. **Are the applicant’s qualifications presented in a clear and compelling way?**
   1. Do the different sections work together to present a clear and coherent picture of the candidate? Are there connections in terms of interest, specialization, and skill between the research, publications, and professional experience and activities sections?
   2. Are there concrete details to indicate excellence? Does the applicant rely on active verbs such as “Implemented,” “Investigated,” “Reported,” etc.?
   3. Does the “Honors and Awards” section appropriately indicate the degree of recognition the candidate has received in his or her area of study?
3. **What needs to stay? What needs to go?**
   1. Is there anything that seems irrelevant (AKA “padding”)? What could be cut? Are there gaps? What could be added?
   2. Does the applicant provide enough supporting detail to describe his or her research experiences? Too much?
4. **Imagine you’re interviewing for a residency program.**
   1. What do you still need to know about this applicant?
   2. Which element makes you want to hire this person? Where is the CV at its best?
   3. Is there anything on this CV that would make you think twice about hiring this person?
5. **Final thoughts or questions?**