Please delete information marked with \*

\*FILE NAME: YOURNAME\_PR\_AUTHOR'S NAME (Ivanova\_N\_PR\_Petrov\_P)

**\* The goal of this task is to help your colleague improve their assignment. The Review should be a coherent TEXT. The comments should be relevant and politely formulated.**

**\*Review structure:**

* **Summary of the Reviewed Proposal (Obligatory! 50 words).**
* **Text of the review (You can use the prompts below to help you structure your review and address all relevant issues). Please make any observations that would help your colleague to improve their writing.**
* **Conclusion: Positive comments/ things you liked.**

**Suggestions for improvement (Obligatory!).**

**\_\_\_\_**

**TEMPLATE**

**Author:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Title**:\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer**:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Summary of the text** (\***OBLIGATORY**! 50 words, e.g.: The Project under review is devoted to...)

**Text of the Review.**

***The prompts below are to help you structure your review and address all relevant issues. Please add any comments that would be relevant for the improvement of the text.***

1. How well does the Title reflect the subject being written about?
2. How well is the text organized? Is IMRaD structure used? Is information presented in appropriate sections? Are all sections balanced?
3. What structural changes **can you recommend**?
4. How clearly is the problem statement defined? Is the significance of the problem duly highlighted?
5. How clearly are the objectives defined?
6. How well is the choice of the methods explained in the context of the problem stated?
7. How effectively are the methods described and assessed?
8. How accurately are the results summarized/presented?
9. Do the results match research objectives and method description?
10. How well are the conclusions formulated and justified?
11. How well do the conclusions indicate the value of the findings and to whom will they be of use?
12. Is the presented material appropriate for the intended multidisciplinary audience?
13. How relevant/ up-to-date is the material?
14. How well written (in terms of grammar, word choice, academic style, etc.) is the Project? Is the storyline clear?
15. Does the text conform to the word limit of 650 words?
16. Does the abstract have between 3 to 5 keywords or phrases that closely reflect the content of the paper?
17. Are there 3-10 references? Are the references properly and consistently formatted? Is IEEE style used?

Grading criteria can be used as a reference for any additional prompts related to text parameters. You **are not required** **to grade** the Project.

**Conclusion (\*Obligatory!)**

**What was good? What did you as a Reviewer like about the text?**

**What advice can you give** the author to help them improve their text?