

---

---

**PEER REVIEW MEMO**

---

---

**TO:** CECELIA MUSSELMAN  
**FROM:** NATHAN HUNT  
**SUBJECT:** PROJECT 2 PEER REVIEW  
**DATE:** FEBRUARY 28, 2016  
**CC:** JONATHAN WAGNER

---

**Summary:** The paper indulges in the ways supercritical fluids can be created and used in the scientific world. The use of supercritical fluids offers health benefits to those who are in continuous contact with more hazardous, organic solvents. The paper also elaborates on how supercritical fluids are more sustainable and environmentally friendly.

**Major Points:** The paper is dense. The paragraphs are massive and include a lot of technical details that only someone in the field would fully understand, but since the audience of this paper isn't me, that's probably alright. I did find it hard to find information when retreading, so splitting the information into smaller, more specific paragraphs could be a major benefit to the reader.

The introduction feels like a paragraph that belongs in the body of the paper, mainly because it immediately dives into technical details that don't appear in their own paragraph. The first few sentences do a good job in introducing the concept of a supercritical fluid.

Overall, the paper does a tremendous job of covering the specifics of the topic, but it's a bit hard to navigate. The content can stay the same, but dividing it into more focuses sections would make a world of difference.

**Minor Points:** Prof. Musselman gave us a format to use, but I'm not sure if we are strictly expected to use it. If not, the formatting on this paper seems fine. I didn't notice any spelling or grammar errors, so a quick (but careful) proofreading should be enough to guarantee there aren't any mistakes.