**Peer Editing**

**Writer**: Connor Vass **Reviewer: Matt lavelle**

For each section, comment briefly (yes/no answers are not acceptable) on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the draft. Try to point out at least two strong qualities for each section as well as one area that could use revision. For revisions, please indicate why the section needs work and offer suggestions for improvement.

Be sure to note specific examples to make the feedback as concrete as possible.

1. **Organization**

Questions to consider:

* Is there an Introduction, Discussion Section and Conclusion?

The introduction is good but could use a little more pun ash.

* Is there one main idea/theme per paragraph starting with a topic sentence?
* Do the sections follow an intuitive and logical progression?

yes

* Is there use of bullets/numbering and if so, is it effective?
* Is there a space between each paragraph?

1. **Language**

Questions to consider:

* Does the writer use direct language?

yes

* Is the language precise and descriptive?

yes

* Does the writer use language that is clear and to the point?

yes

* Has the writer adopted an appropriate tone for the audience?

Tone could be improved upon particularly with the flow of the words.

1. **Overall Impression**

Questions to consider:

* Knowing that this is still a draft, does the document seem professional and complete?

No it needs small changes and improvements before being complete but the major pieces are there.

* What steps can the writer take to create a stronger document overall?

Use ai to rewrite the whole paragraph and use pieces from it for inspiration.

* Is coherence apparent in the writer’s use of transitions to connect sentences, paragraphs, and sections?

Could be improved, flow will fix this as stated before.