

Reviewing with domain expertise

Match review work to the knowledge it requires, and make professional judgments understandable to the next reviewer.

Purpose and inputs

Use domain review where a mechanical check cannot establish correctness, relevance, or practical usefulness. The review plan should identify the required experience for each task instead of assuming one credential covers every decision.

Prepare the task brief, source evidence, candidate outputs, scoring criteria, and examples of acceptable and unacceptable work. Define any qualifications the project requires and how those qualifications will be checked.

Working steps

1. Specify the review roles: Separate task authoring, independent scoring, and disagreement resolution. Match each role to its subject knowledge and working context; record conflicts that could affect judgment.
2. Calibrate on shared examples: Ask reviewers to score a small common set independently. Compare reasons as well as scores, and clarify criteria before reviewing a larger batch.
3. Record and resolve differences: Attach each judgment to a criterion and evidence. Route unresolved cases to an agreed adjudicator, then record the decision and any resulting rubric change.

Deliverables

- Role requirements
- Calibrated rubric
- Scoring records
- Adjudication log

Review and acceptance

Require complete review records, explicit uncertainty, and documented decisions on disputed cases. Report reviewer agreement for the actual batch; avoid treating credentials alone as evidence of output quality.

This guide describes a project approach. It is not a customer result, a performance benchmark, or a statement of certification.

Related guide: </methodology/expert-review> | Browse downloadable demonstrations at </samples>.