

**Peer Review Instructions:**

In every professional conference, there is a peer review phase in the paper submission process. The purpose of the peer review is two fold: 1) Have experts in the area review the paper to assure the technical accuracy of the material presented, 2) Have experts in the field provide feedback on the paper content to help improve the quality of the paper.

Your task is to perform a review of a fellow student paper. A paper number will be assigned to you for peer review. Download the paper assigned to you for review. Read the paper and make suggested changes on the paper **in an ink other than black**, then, complete this form when you are done and attach this form to the paper that you reviewed. As you read the paper check for the material listed below on the review form and provide helpful comments so the authors can use your comments to improve their paper. You will submit both this form and the paper you reviewed in class on Thursday after Spring Break.

Check Excellent, Good, Acceptable, or Serious Problems for each category, below, and briefly note on this form the nature of any problems. Also make any other notes, here and on the paper, that might be useful to the authors. When you are done put your name on the last page.

Note your name will be cut off the paper before it is returned to the author, so they will not know who did the review. (Note, do not print this form out on 2-sided). **The grade you receive on this assignment will be based on the quality of your review.**

AUTHORS \_\_\_\_\_ PAPER# \_\_\_\_\_

**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATION**

**Format**     Excellent     Good     Acceptable     Serious Problems

Does the paper follow all formatting specifications? On the paper, note any formatting errors with "form."

**Grammar, Punctuation**     Excellent     Good     Acceptable     Serious Problems

Are grammar and punctuation consistently correct throughout the paper? On the paper, mark any grammar problems "g"; mark any punctuation problems "p."

**Proofreading**     Excellent     Good     Acceptable     Serious Problems

Does the paper appear to have been carefully proofread prior to submission? On the paper, mark proofreading errors ("typos," misspelled words, missed words, words that are correctly spelled but used incorrectly, etc.) "pf."

---

**CONTENT**

**Focus:**     Excellent     Good     Acceptable     Serious Problems

Has the central topic/focus of the paper been clearly articulated? If so, please state, here, what the topic/focus is. If not, mark a place on the paper where the topic or focus should be stated, and suggest an effective articulation of the topic.

**Specificity/Support:**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

Are all claims made in the paper clearly supported with appropriate data, details, and/or examples? If specificity/support is weak, mark the area of weakness “spec,” and briefly clarify for the authors the types of specificity/support that would improve clarity and impact.

**Explanation/Description of Technologies**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

Are technologies fully and clearly described and explained? Are details and examples used effectively to promote clear descriptions of technologies? On the paper, mark areas of weakness in descriptions/explanations of technologies “tech det.” Briefly clarify for the authors what kinds of details/explanations need to be added and integrated for maximum immediate and ongoing clarity.

**Arrangement/Logic**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

Are sections placed in logical, effective order? Are all sections relevant to the paper-as-a-whole? On the paper, mark problems with arrangement or logic “arr” or “log.” Briefly describe how the authors could revise to maximize immediate and ongoing logical progression of information.

**Connections/Cohesion**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

Are connections within and among sections clearly established and maintained? On the paper, note gaps in connection or cohesion “conn.” Briefly describe what the authors need to do to establish better connections and reinforce cohesion.

**Title, Headings, Graphics**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

Does the paper’s title effectively introduce/summarize the paper’s content? Do headings help advance the logic of the paper? Are graphics clearly labeled and logically placed? Are there any irrelevant graphics? On the paper, note any problems with the paper’s title, headings, or graphics. Provide brief suggestions for improvement.

---

**Overall Rating**  Excellent  Good  Acceptable  Serious Problems

**Overall Notes:**

.....

**Put Your name, your ENGR0012 section (your name and section will be removed from this form before it is given to the authors):**

**Your Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**PAPER# YOU REVIEWED** \_\_\_\_\_

**Your Instructor:**

<b>Circle Section:</b>	<b>Budny 10 AM</b>	<b>Bursic 2 PM</b>	<b>Miller 4 PM</b>
	<b>Vidic 10 AM</b>	<b>Vidic 2 PM</b>	