

# Received Peer Reviews

Instructor Reviewer Brian Cannon	Peer Reviewer Dominic Chang
<p>Propositional Content</p> <p>Partially meets expectations</p> <p><i>The prop can be better set up in the Intro by immediately focusing on the specifics of the env. problem; what is the relationship here, and how might you frame this as a particularly environment issue, beyond just basic detail on AI (which would already be known to audience)? Prop itself is sufficiently focused for this stage. LoR does not flow esp. well; History and How Models Trained sections largely not needed, instead the focus should be directly on energy use and environmental costs. Pay particular attention to transitions; it is unclear how many of these sections relate to one another without clearer linking sentences. Note the language of the Mutually Exclusive section is the type of focused rhetoric you want to begin the paper with!</i></p>	
<p>Invention</p> <p>Partially meets expectations</p> <p><i>The topic is timely and well-suited to the WP genre. Without clear source citations, it is impossible to gauge synthesis; please make this a priority for draft 2.</i></p>	
<p>Rhetoric</p> <p>Partially meets expectations</p> <p><i>Avoid use of "we" and "our" throughout; this collective voice is not typically employed in the WP genre. Intro should explicitly flag target and secondary audiences: who are the stakeholders in this issue? Those mentioned in rhet. outline are likely viable but need explicit attention in body text. Solutions should be particular to the target audience; aim to refine this in successive drafts by considering what your flagged stakeholders specifically have done to address the issue, or what might be of most use to them?</i></p>	
<p>Genre</p> <p>Partially meets expectations</p> <p><i>The paper does not adhere esp. well to the formal elements of the genre. Re-visit the samples we read in class for examples of these, and pay close attention to length (this draft is far too long, aim for relevance to env. issue and concision throughout), structure in clear prob/sol'n format, layout, and tone. Socially, the paper struggles to exhibit audience awareness without clear language directed towards named stakeholders.</i></p>	
<p>Presentation</p> <p>Effort made but insufficient to meet expectations</p> <p><i>Paper title can better signal thrust of main argument; what problem is this WP looking to solve? Paper includes no citations for text and most visuals, and biblio. is listed as URLs only; these should be clearly ID'ed and formatted per Chicago style for draft 2.</i></p>	
<p>Aesthetics/Reading Experience</p> <p>Partially meets expectations</p> <p><i>This draft is hindered by a plethora of detail that is less relevant to the immediate problem at hand on env. costs, and so makes the paper less engaging throughout.</i></p>	
<p>Weighted Average</p> <p>C</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p><i>Major areas of focus for revision: source synthesis; language scaled to stakeholders; logical flow in argumentation; attention to genre elements; citation practice.</i></p>	

## Instructor Reviewer

Brian Cannon

## Peer Reviewer

Simon Lee

### Propositional Content

Mostly meets expectations

*I think you did a good job of setting up your premise which is that AI is unsustainable right now. Maybe you could make it more concise.*

### Invention

Mostly meets expectations

*I think that this is a creative and nontrivial solution to the problem you describe. You've coherently brought together a variety of different sources.*

### Rhetoric

Mostly meets expectations

*I think that your language is appropriately technical to the level of the audience. Just something I'm wondering: You have three distinct readers. The level of understanding a pure AI researcher has about chips might be significantly different from a chip manufacturer. Maybe narrow the "AI researcher" reader to "AI computing researcher?"*

### Genre

Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations

*The paper meets all of the white paper content requirements.*

### Presentation

Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations

*The paper is organized and the visuals are put at appropriate locations. I think you could introduce subheadings to ensure that a reader that skims can easily find information.*

### Aesthetics/Reading Experience

Mostly meets expectations

*I like how you create personal connections by mentioning pertinent global issues such as the global climate crisis.*

### Weighted Average

B+

### General Comments

*I think you're on the right track. Conciseness could be helpful generally.*

## Draft 1 Revision Plan

### Valuable Suggestions:

- The prop can be better set up in the introduction by making the introduction shorter and focus on the relevant specifics of the environmental problem. How is it an environmental issue beyond AI?
- LoR does not flow well
- Pay attention to transitions as it is unclear how sections relate to each other.
- Intro should flag the stakeholders in this issue - both target and secondary audiences.
- Draft is too long and not a formal white paper structure.

### Invalid/Non-Applicable Suggestions:

- No clear citations and unclear title.
- Avoid the use of “we” and “our”

### What is Working Well:

- Prop is good.
- Topic is timely and well-suited to the WP genre.

### Action Items:

- Removed the extensive background section on History of AI and Training AI Models to focus more on the environmental impacts of climate change (energy usage associated with data centers and the consequent carbon emissions impact) – which should also simplify the Line of Reasoning
- The first draft had paragraphs out of order for drafting purposes – will rearrange the paragraphs to have the correct order and transitions, which should help with the LoR and make clear how the sections relate to each other. In the end, it should have a proper problem, solution format and layout.
- My citations were in Google Doc comments, which did not get translated onto the PDF. For the next draft, I will simply move the citations into the actual paper in the Chicago format.
- Unsure of not using "we" and "our"... need more clarification. Didn't the McKinsey paper we read use "we"? Also the linked whitepaper published by Bitcoin foundation used "we" and "our" in their white papers.
- Directly mentioned target and secondary audiences in the prop, which were “deeptech VCs, chip manufacturers, and AI researchers” and specifically mentioned how problems/solutions can affect the audiences.
- Added a paper title: Biocomputing as a Solution for Future Sustainable AI Developments  
A White Paper Advocating the Development of Biocomputing for Venture Capitalists, AI Researchers, and Chip Manufacturers
- Adjusted tone to be more “white paper” formal.

## Draft 2 Revision Plan

### Valuable Suggestions:

- Make background more concise (I agree that it is long)
- My language is not scaled technically to all my distinct readers, which I said was AI researchers, chip manufacturers, and VCs.
- Add subheadings to make my paper easier to skim.

### Invalid/Non-Applicable Suggestions:

N/A

### What is Working Well:

- Setting up the premise that AI is unsustainable.
- Creative, nontrivial solution to the problem after analysis of shortfalls of current solutions
- Genre is like a white paper.
- Organized and has lots of visuals.

### Action Items:

- Based on the valuable suggestion to make my background more concise, I aim to shorten the background section. My first step would be to remove repetitive details, as I cited many examples of the same topic or idea to reinforce an idea. I might also cut down more on the introduction section, particularly within the paragraphs that highlight the explosive growth of AI (beginning 2-3 paragraphs). But the heavy use of graphs and figures I think serves to reinforce my premise, so I will not remove graphs and figures from my introduction. My question is also: since I want to continue this writing past this semester and write a longer and more substantial white paper, should I write a short white paper for the class specifically and expand on it after the class ends?
- I need to figure out how to scale my language to all my distinct readers. For example, AI researchers would know a lot about AI but not a lot about chip solutions, and vice versa for chip manufacturers, while VCs in general would have a lower knowledge of this entire field. How can I accomplish this? Need more assistance here. I might start off by narrowing my audience to purely deeptech investors and chip manufacturers. For investors, I will lean more heavily towards selling the introduction section to reinforce the idea that this is a big problem with lots of monetary potential, and for chip manufacturers, I will lean more heavily on problem section to show that current “solutions” to mitigating the AI energy crisis is flawed, and then lead them onto the solutions section. Both VCs and chip manufacturers should have a basic understanding of the problems associated with traditional semiconductors.
- As per the received suggestions, I will add a lot more subheadings to differentiate between certain paragraphs, for example in the solutions paragraph I would have subheadings on "Heat", "Bottlenecks", "Sustainability", etc. Overall, it would make it easier to skim.

# Peer Review of Colleague's Draft 1

Reviewer: Maxx Yung

Submitter: Dominic Chang

**Propositional Content:** Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations, 4

- The prop is short (which is good) but further define "proper" within your prop. Proper should be defined within a premise, perhaps something along the lines of "lacks proper regulation to ensure it isn't abused" or something similar.
- The background/intro sets up the prop nicely, and it was easy to follow along.

**Invention:** Partially meets expectations, 2

- I believe your solutions to your defined problem is mostly a summary of various statements put out by the organizations you mentioned in your paper, and not really your own thoughts. Your analysis is what the 3 organizations have said instead of your own proposed solution. I know you didn't finish, but when you write "it becomes clear that crypto needs specialized regulation", are you going to input your own unique view on the regulations?
- However, I do believe this paper is timely, as crypto is starting to gain more steam in the financial sector.

**Rhetoric:** Partially meets expectations, 2

- You are targeting crypto interest groups and regulating entities, so you would need to frame your paper at a higher level since these major institutions would know a lot more than the introductory statements you provide. You would probably need to go more into specific details regarding this problem, such as specific legislations passed and previous attempts to solve this problem. I think this will be hard to do as someone who isn't an expert in crypto legislation, though.
- Find and cite real life examples of crypto regulations, what worked, and what didn't, like case studies, I feel like that would be more engaging to the targeted audience of what regulations they should implement based on prior ones.
- Ultimately, I think your paper and the language used throughout the paper is scaled for more of a general audience and not for crypto organizations who should be very knowledgeable of this field beyond the introductory comments.

**Genre:** Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations, 4

- Proper use of citations, titles, and subheading to allow for skimmability.
- Clear social purpose: calls for more crypto regulation.
- You would probably need to work more on "Genre knowledge entails understanding what readers expect from the genre, what reader/writer relationships the genre creates and generates, how, when, where and why to use one genre rather than another, and what the

motives are of the genre's author and readers" If targeting regulatory bodies, you would probably need a more defined solution path as stated above, and go into what works and what doesn't work right now in terms of crypto regulation.

**Presentation:** Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations, 4

- Nice presentation of your work. Some minor grammar mistakes that can be fixed easily.
- I would add bullet points/numbers everywhere possible for readability. For example, maybe a table for the "International Consensus" section, since I think that can all be summarized nicely in a giant table.

**Aesthetics/Reading Experience:** Mostly meets expectations, 3

- Ignoring lack of images, I would say add more tables in certain sections, and try to bullet point as much as possible (my personal preference) but it makes info easier to read and skim (which apparently is very big since we have to assume "people won't read your entire paper")
- Paper is well-written, and as someone who is interested in crypto, I found the paper engaging from a not-well-educated-in-crypto-legislation viewpoint.

**Weighted Average:** B+

### **General Comments**

- Fix minor grammars
- More images, more tables, more bullet points.
- If you are going to continue targeting regulatory bodies in crypto, I think adding specific case studies would be valuable.
- Consider another audience group, such as voters to pressure certain crypto regulations.

## Peer Review of Colleague's Draft 2

Reviewer: Maxx Yung

Submitter: Simon Lee

**Propositional Content:** Mostly meets expectations, 3

Easily understandable prop and tailored for the target audience. Background provides solid information to demonstrate AI bias and why that's important.

**Invention:** Partially meets expectations, 2

Good solutions to problems. I feel for HR specialists, some of these solutions are out of their control and more tailored for people making the model for recruitment. Based on initial reading, solutions seem to be the common solutions already pursued by companies.

**Rhetoric:** Mostly meets expectations, 3

Scaled for HR specialist audience well, the information is understood for a non-specialist in AI, the table makes it an easy summary. Only question/concern is HR specialists grasping the more specialized terms in AI, and the relevance to them since they do not manage or alter the models they use.

**Genre:** Meets and sometimes exceeds expectations, 4

Sounds like a white paper. Throughout it, aims to convince that this topic is a problem, and provided context for HR specialists on why it is a problem, and offered a better understanding of the solutions.

**Presentation:** Consistently exceeds expectations, 5

formatting and grammar, etc, looks fine.

**Aesthetics/Reading Experience:** Partially meets expectations, 2

too text heavy, even if it is broken up with lots of headings. need more images, figures, tables.

**Weighted Average:** B+

Copy of Draft 1 White Paper that I Peer Reviewed  
**Attached below.**