Peer Review IT Paper

The essay presents an evaluation of a paper written by one of my classmates. I will review the paper from seven perspectives, including writing, references, table and figures use, format, topic, length and intellectual, in that order.

**Writing**

The first heading uses the wrong preposition "to" instead of "of". Besides, he has also referred to a person as "it", which is a wrong use of the pronoun. Other grammatical errors include wrong punctuations, especially use of commas. The writer also used the indefinite article "an" to describe insufficient, which is not correct because sufficient is a non-countable noun. Other grammatical errors present throughout the paper include misuse of prepositions. Further, the writer uses the wrong verb tense, present perfect tense; yet, he is reporting on a project he undertook, and therefore, he should use past tense.

**References**

The report has seven sources in the reference list section, which are three sources less than the recommended ten sources. Besides, the writer does not cite these sources correctly in the text because he uses the titles of the sources other than in the format authors' surname and year. Additionally, in one source, he uses the journal name. The writer also leaves the URLS for online sources in the reference list section, which according to APA format should be provided for websites.

**Table and figures**

The writer has not labeled the tables and figures he has included in the report. Some tables and figures the writer used are superfluous and do not add value to the project. For

instance, figure 1 reports on breaches relating to medical record experienced from 2010 to 2013, which does not add any value to the paper. Besides, the figure is complex and confusing to the reader.

**Format**

From the start, I have notice a problem with the format. While this paper is intended to be in APA style, the author has not correctly placed the header at the upper left; instead, he has placed it at the center. In addition, the cover page has not been formatted correctly; the name of the author should be placed on the second line after the title of the paper, before the institution, and it should not have a date. Further, the writer of the article has not written the table of content properly, as a table of content should be numbered using roman numbers for first level headings, while alphabetical letter are used for the second level heading and Arabic numbers for the third level heading.

Moreover, a paper should not have just a single second level subheading, in which case the information should be considered as a discussion of the first level heading. The paper does not start with an introduction in which he should have stated the objective of the paper. Therefore, the paper is not in the proper structure of a proposal, which starts with the introduction, literature review, and methodology. The first headings, which ought to be under the introduction, are not well titled. The objective of the project should be a second level subheading of the introduction. Other second level headings to introduction are statement of the problem, research question and hypothesis.

**Topic**

In my opinion, this topic cannot be completed in one semester because the language and security aspect of the portal need plenty of time to determine how to achieve these goals.

Because the topic is already narrow, I feel that the writer should include translating the information in a portal to a layman language, although the experts will still have to retain some medical terms as a simplifying them may be impossible, or may distort the actual meaning of the term.

**Length**

The paper does not meet the page requirement for a research project. The writer has omitted the methodology section and the discussion, although he has used other subheadings that cover the information that fits these sections. Under the "Project Details" subheading, for example, the writer actually covered the literature review, which he ought to have covered after the "Point of view & argument" heading, which should be the statement of the problem. The heading on objective of the project should be shortened as the writer has repeated most of its points in the "point of view & argument" section to prevent redundancy. Other sections the writer included in the paper should not even constitute the paper. For instance, the section that describes the faculty advisor is completely out of place and the author should remove it. The heading "Resources" should be replaced with methodology and more information given to explain how the writer intends to execute the objective of the project. The heading "risk factors" should actually be limitations.

**Intellectual**

I am not convinced that the writer fully understands this topic because he makes it sound like it is so easy for an individual to set up and down a medical portal. Actually, setting up a portal is very expensive and rather not feasible for all people to have and manage their own. Actually, an individual's medical portal is established by the hospital from which a person seeks

medical services that updates it based on the clients continued visit to the facility. The author did

not expand and build upon many sources, but he reiterated most of them.