## Project 3 Peer Review

Reviewer's Name: _____          Project under review: _____

   Your professor will be grading your writeup not only on its content (background, model, results, and analysis), but also its clarity of exposition, organization of ideals, and spelling and grammar. Approaching a project as a **reader** and **evaluator** gives you a different perspective than you have as a writer. As you provide feedback to your peers about their drafts, keep in mind the following:

- Be respectful and considerate of the writers' feelings.
- **Offer suggestions**, not commands.
- **Raise questions** from a reader's point of view, points that may not have occurred to the writers.
- Phrase comments **clearly** and **carefully** so that the writer can easily understand what needs to be improved.
- Make sure comments are **constructive** and **specific**. For example,

**Don't write:** "This paper is confusing. It keeps saying the same things over and over again."
   **Do write:** "It sounds like paragraph 5 makes the same point as paragraphs 2 and 3."

# Answer in bullet points. Sentences are not necessary.

**Introduction.** Does the introductory section **motivate** the project statement and give relevant background information, without going into too many unimportant details? Give specific examples. **Is the project statement clear?**

**Model assumptions.** Is the model based on clear, well thought-out assumptions that have been explicitly stated? What other assumptions are important? Do the writers cite where their data comes from?

**Model description.** Does the paper explicitly explain that a simulation was created to model the real-world situation? Are the population dynamics underlying the model explained carefully? Is it clear (to you, the reader) how the model is similar to and different from the model in our class? Does the model add complexity to the base model from class?

**Results.** When the model is applied, are the results presented in a clear manner **with** useful visualizations and **without** subjective opinions? Are the results mathematically correct? Do the figures convey useful information? Is there a more useful visualization the authors could use? Do the results answer the question posed in the problem statement?

**Analysis - Assumptions.** Did the authors discuss the validity of the model's assumptions as discussed in the methodology? Did the authors address whether their assumptions come from detailed analysis or whether they are guesses? What other assumptions should be critiqued and evaluated?

**Analysis - Model Quality.** Have the authors evaluated their model thoroughly, addressing its various qualities such as accuracy, precision, generality, and fruitfulness? Have the authors been critical and honest about how well the simulation models the real-world situation? What other aspects of the model could be evaluated?

**Analysis - Limitations.** Do the authors discuss the limitations of their model? Are possible errors addressed which could impact the quality of their conclusions? What other limitations might the authors wish to address?

**Future Work and Conclusions.** Are improvements to the models discussed? Are directions for future study discussed? Does the paper conclude well or is the end abrupt?

**Title and Abstract.** Did the authors give their project a descriptive title? Does the abstract convey the paper's essence, including the project statement, the method of approach, and key results answering the project statement? Is the abstract concise and precise?

**Focus. Does the project stay on topic throughout?** In particular, is the project focused on developing, using, and evaluating the model? Or does the text stray into irrelevant discussions not focused on the model? Is the material ordered in a way that is easy to follow? Give examples.

**Style.** Is the writer's writing style clear? Were the paragraphs and sentences cohesive? Does the paper appear to have been written by different people or does it have a unified style? Are there any grammatical or spelling problems? Problems with tenses?

**Writeup Strengths.** What was the strongest part of the project, which should be kept during revisions?

**Writeup Weaknesses.** What parts of the project could be improved or expanded?

## Python

Now read through the other group's python code and give feedback about the following.

**Organization.** Is the notebook organized neatly? Is it broken down into sections using Markdown section headings? Have the coders used **text cells** or **comments** to explain to the reader what they are doing in their code?

Share one or more places where the file could use some more organization.

**Coding clarity.** Did the group use python techniques that we learned in class? Is new content explained using comments? Are you able to follow along with what the structure of the code is with these comments?

Does the python discretely model a system of differential equations? Does the python code create **properly labeled** plots of the model?

Give multiple places in the notebook where you feel like the coders could better explain how their code works.