

Peer commentary on paper drafts
--

- On W April 11, you will be assigned a peer-review partner (an individual or a group). Please make arrangements to exchange papers with your peer-review partner as soon as possible.
- On M April 16, you will bring to class some written feedback on the paper. Please bring *two hard copies* of your feedback, one for the author(s) and one for me. (Note: Every member of a group should bring their own feedback for the paper they have read.) The written feedback counts as a (mandatory) pass/fail assignment.
- The purpose of the feedback is to help your classmate(s) improve their paper. Please keep the tone constructive and helpful. Your feedback should explicitly address the following points:
 - (a) Is the paper laid out clearly?
 - The hypothesis, research question, or proposal should be stated near the beginning
 - It should be clear how all the other sections of the paper relate to this
 - If you find any sections that don't seem to fit with the paper's main point, or any aspects of the main point that need further support or discussion, please discuss these in your written commentary
 - (b) Do you see any problems with the implementation of the paper?
 - Do you see any technical errors, such as mistakes in formalisms or definitions, or data sets that don't actually support the generalization being made?
 - Since you represent the paper's intended audience, is there anything in the paper that is not presented clearly enough for you to understand how it works or why it is important?
 - (c) Do you see any important connections to themes we have discussed in class that could have been addressed in the paper but are not?
 - (d) Does the paper meet the other criteria on the grading rubric for the first draft? If not, do you have any suggestions for how the paper could be extended or changed to meet those criteria?
- Note: You do not need to give feedback on grammar/spelling/mechanics/typos unless you wish to, or unless something as it is written is actually unclear.