

## Peer Review Reflection

### Feedback #1:

- The images were uncited, however I made them myself thus no citation is needed...
- Don't have pictures in the introduction, however no reasoning was given and I'm left wondering why?
- Use CARS, my introduction consisted mostly of bulletpoints, thus this feedback did not really apply
- "Some points of the text are not connected" however no more specification was given, thus I'm left wondering again....

Really no part of the feedback #1 was useful nor will be applied. I would consider only half of the feedback valid, however these are so vague and unspecified making it impossible to apply. Overall, this feedback left me with some questions, but I did not pursue the answers because I felt the review didn't give any effort into the review. Additionally, a section of the feedback is very highly suspicious of being AI-generated, specifically a comment in the document, which furthered my dissatisfaction with the review and gave me no wish for the answers.

### Feedback #2:

- Grammarly mistakes
- Title not correlating to the text
- Unexplained terms leaving the reader confused.

Feedback #2 was far more useful. I will reconsider my title as a result, I see how it does not make sense without prior knowledge of the subject matter. The reviewer identified the state of the introduction as in construction, as I wished the reviewer for #1 would have. Points of confusion was identified, some because of misalignment of abbreviations, flow, and lack of explanations, which I will strongly consider for the rest of my writing. However, I am not quite certain where to draw the "reader confusion to detailed explanation"-border, for example the introduction should not go into deep detail about an abbreviation, however it is necessary to mention it in the context of the introduction. But I'm sure most of these confusion areas will disappear with restructuring some aspects/reorganizing some of the flow. The most important feedback was the reader did not understand the relevance of a lot of the research covered, as a result I make sure the reader is well-informed about the problem statements / hypotheses before the introduction is complete. Minor grammar errors highlighted were not helpful as they were found in a highly unfinished/draft section of the texts, however maybe this means the rest of the grammar is fine.