

Peer-to-Peer Feedback: 5 Detailed Examples & Top Tips

Source: leapsome | **Published:** March 25, 2026 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS CORE | **Type:** Practitioner Guide | **Geography:** Global

Source URL: <https://site.leapsome.com/blog/peer-to-peer-feedback>

Executive Summary

This article, published by Leapsome, addresses the growing relevance of peer-to-peer feedback in organizational performance management, particularly as managerial bandwidth decreases. The author argues that peer feedback bridges gaps left by overstretched managers, promotes employee engagement, and enriches 360-degree review processes with perspectives unavailable to supervisors. Key evidence includes a statistic from Leapsome's own 2024 Workforce Trends Report claiming 81% of upper-level managers experienced an increase in direct reports, alongside a claim that peer feedback can boost performance by up to 14% and that 80% of employees find constructive feedback enhances their productivity. The article presents five illustrative workplace scenarios demonstrating positive, constructive, and balanced peer feedback exchanges across industries. It further offers practical guidance including behavioral specificity, balance between positive and developmental feedback, use of structured models (SBI and STAR), timely delivery, and adoption of purpose-built digital tools. Conclusions drawn point toward formalized peer feedback processes as strategically valuable — and position Leapsome's own product suite as the enabling infrastructure for such processes.

Key Insights

1. Peer-to-peer feedback is framed as a structural response to managerial capacity constraints, with Leapsome's own data indicating 81% of upper-level managers reported increased direct reports in 2024.
2. The article asserts peer feedback can boost performance by up to 14% and that 80% of surveyed employees report constructive feedback enhances productivity — both figures sourced from Leapsome's proprietary Workforce Trends Report.
3. Structured models such as SBI (Situation-Behavior-Impact) and STAR (Situation-Task-Action-Result) are presented as tools to reduce bias and improve the clarity of peer feedback exchanges.

Practical Takeaways

- Feedback grounded in specific observable behaviors and real-life examples — rather than personal attributes — is described as more effective and less likely to cause interpersonal friction.
- Timely delivery of feedback, close to the event in question, is identified as a mechanism for real-time learning and reducing contextual inaccuracy or misunderstanding.

Frameworks Mentioned

360-Degree Review — A multi-source feedback method referenced as a context in which peer-to-peer feedback diversifies performance perspectives beyond manager-only evaluations.

SBI Feedback Model — A structured feedback model used to organize peer observations into situation, behavior, and impact components to improve clarity and reduce miscommunication.

STAR (Situation-Task-Action-Result) — A structured model for framing feedback or behavioral examples in terms of situation, task, action, and result, presented as an alternative to SBI for peer feedback sessions.

Critical Analysis

The article's primary limitation is its source: it is vendor-produced content from Leapsome, a performance management software company, and the majority of statistics cited originate from Leapsome's own 2024 Workforce Trends Report — a proprietary study with no disclosed methodology, sample size, or independent validation. The 14% performance boost claim is stated without attribution to any specific study. The five workplace scenarios are illustrative composites, not verified case studies, limiting their evidential weight. External voices (Jessica Knight of Gartner, Brigid Gannon of Lavender Psychiatry, Michelle Maree of Forbes) lend third-party credibility, though their quotes are brief and decontextualized. On the strengths side, the structural tips (behavioral specificity, timeliness, balance of feedback types, use of SBI/STAR) are consistent with established feedback literature. The scenarios, while fictional, effectively illustrate nuanced peer dynamics across different workplace contexts. The article's recommendations converge predictably on Leapsome's own product features, which constitutes a clear commercial orientation that readers should account for when evaluating its conclusions.

Organizational Practice

The article describes organizations incorporating peer-to-peer feedback into continuous performance management cycles, using structured review software to automate notifications, customize review templates, and capture feedback analytics. Some organizations are described as embedding peer feedback into 360-degree review processes to supplement managerial evaluations with colleague perspectives.

Strategic Implications

The article reflects a broader trend toward distributed feedback accountability in organizations where managerial span of control is widening. The emphasis on tooling and structured workflows suggests organizational interest in systematizing informal peer exchange into auditable, repeatable processes. The framing of peer feedback as a complement to — rather than replacement for — managerial evaluation indicates evolving hybrid models of performance assessment.

Validation Status: passed
