

Peer Review of Modeling Project

Your professor will be grading your project not only on its content (background, model, results, and analysis), but also its clarity of exposition, organization of ideas, 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."

To do: First, skim the project to get a feel for its organization; make large-scale comments if they occur to you as you read. Next, read the project in detail and make comments on the draft and on this sheet. Think to address the following points.

CONTENT

- (1) Is the project statement clear? **Does the project stay on topic throughout?**

- (2) Does the introduction **motivate** the project statement and/or give relevant background information?

- (3) Did the authors spend the right amount of words explaining the model's assumptions and errors? Explain.

- (4) Is the analysis performed by the writers correct? Are there any gross overstatements of results?

OVERVIEW

- (1) What was the strongest part of the project, which should be kept during revisions?

Please turn over

(2) Give **at least two** parts of the project that should be expanded during revision. In what ways were these parts weak? How might the writers improve these parts?

(3) Suggest sections of the project that are redundant or full of fluff, which should be shortened or removed during revision. Explain why you are making these suggestions.

STRUCTURE (Mark directly on the draft)

(1) Was the material ordered in a way that was logical, clear, easy to follow? Explain.

(2) Were there any grammatical or spelling problems?

(3) Was the writer's writing style clear? Were the paragraphs and sentences cohesive?

(4) Did the writer cite sources adequately and appropriately? Note any incorrect formatting.

(5) Were all the citations in the text listed in the Literature Cited section? Note any discrepancies.