Methods:	Do the methods completely capture the essence of the experiment? missing methods Is there anything that's missing? Is there anything that's extraneous? missing methods make sure to put source name used for graphing and overall lab experiment @procedure should be summarized.
Change	What is one element of the report that you think should be changed? The formatting doesn't seem right (the one expected) It should be completed → intro, methods, discussion
Polish	What is one element of the report that's *almost* there but could use a bit of polishing? Results → the formatting of the table and
Keep	What is one element that's really good, and should definitely make it into the final draft? The stress-strain graph presented and ref

Author Plan of Action

List 3 changes you plan to make in your next revision, be specific and provide a brief explanation as to why:

1. Finish the report completely
2. Fix grammar errors
3.

Reviewer Suggestions

Results:	Are the results complete? Y/N Y If not, what's missing? Are the results clearly presented, and should any changes be made? the figure caption should be below the table. the caption should not be capatalized
Discussion:	Are all results discussed and all discussion questions answered? Y/N If not, what's missing? N no results has been discussed. Discussion questions are also not answered. make sure to explain your results and answer all the discussion questions in a flowy manner. Are all the discussed points technically correct (to the best of your knowledge)? discussion has been not conducted

Peer Review Sheet

Name of Writer: Jamie Kang

Name of Reviewer(s): Alka Devi Uhrani

In this activity you will be reviewing a classmate's lab report. While you're working through the report open the rubric on LEARN to guide you. This document and the original draft must be submitted along with your final report. Please submit as three separate documents.

The primary goal is to give feedback on **Content** and **Structure**.

Content concerns the analysis, results, and thought process communicated in the report. When providing feedback on content you should think about the following questions:

1. Is anything missing? (Results, background, discussion)
2. Is there extraneous content that shouldn't be there?
3. Is the information technically accurate?

Structure concerns the flow of the report. In a short report it should be very easy to trace a cohesive thought through the entire report. Start with the discussion:

1. Is there a clear logical flow to the discussion? It shouldn't seem like the author is answering a series of questions (even though they are!).
2. Read each of the discussion questions in the manual:
    a. Can you identify where/how it was answered?
    b. Working backwards identify where the supporting information is. Each discussion question will be supported by a result, which in turn will have a method associated with it and the concept should be introduced in the introduction.

As you are reading, you can also make comments on **Style** (tone, word choice, formality) and **Mechanics** (punctuation, spelling, grammar) but this is not the focus of the exercise. When writing in a new subject area it's very common to make stylistic and mechanical errors. This is because you're focused on the new technical material so it's easy to overlook stylistic and mechanical errors even when your writing is normally excellent. As you build a better understanding of the technical concepts, the style and mechanics of your writing will naturally improve too.

Lastly and most importantly, remember to be kind and respectful to each other. Having your work reviewed is intimidating but can really improve your understanding, your writing, and your grades.