Peer Review 2 Guide

1. Is there a title? Does the title adequately describe what the draft is about?
    a. The Title is simply "Types of Fitness Tracker and its Impact." It describes what the draft is about, but it is not catchy,
2. List the main points made in the draft, in order that they are presented in the paper.
    a. Key Points: Testing three different types of fitness tracking devices, their impact on user's health, their safety, and is intended to convince the reader of their quality/safety. Device has origins in 2006, cementing the student's claim that it is an emerging technology. The features of the three devices are listed. Primary risk factor is competition, not only against each other, but against phone apps which eliminate the need for a dedicated device.
3. Which main points need more support? More evidence, more tables/figures, references, etc.
    a. The project could stand to benefit from the inclusion of tables/figures that compare the features of the devices.
4. Which main points, if any, should be eliminated, as they do not contribute to the overall theme of the paper?
    a. Nothing should really be cut, as if anything, the draft likely needs more information.
5. Are the main points out of order? If so, how would you reorder the paper?
    a. They seem perfectly in order to me. It follows a steady order of intent/objective, background information, the meat of the research being conducted, and then raises risk factors.
6. Are there at least 10 references?
    a. There are 9 references, all of them very recent.
7. Is each of the references cited at least once in the paper?
    a. The student only specifically references the article by Karen Smith-Janssen on Things needed to know before buying fitness trackers.
8. Is the APA style of in-text citations and references used?
    a. Not quite, the student does not use quotation marks to separate what is, and is not their own words. They are close though.
9. If technical jargon is used, is it defined and explained clearly?
    a. The student doesn't really use much technical Jargon. In one case the student uses 'LED,' and doesn't really define it outside of saying it is some sort of "light up system."
10. Is the paper readable by a novice in the field?
    a. For the most part, yes. The student could stand to be a little more specific in respect to what they are referring to. In several cases, they refer to the subject of their research as just 'technology,' when a simple swap to 'device' would be more specific without having to say fitness tracker all of the time.
11. Is the paper at least 10 pages?
    a. The document itself is 10 pages, although the student counts the title page and reference page as part of those 10. They are just not pages I would typically count towards a page limit. Whenever the student finishes a section, they leave the rest of the page it is finished on as white space, electing to start the next section on a new page.
12. Are the sections and headings appropriate for the content within them?
    a. Yes, the headings are simple and very self-evident of what to expect in the sections.

13. In two to three sentences describe the thesis of the paper.
    a. The student's intent is to explore the front-running models of an emerging piece of technology that track the user's fitness and health. In doing so, it will compare and contrast the features they bring to the table against one another and existing phone apps in order to prove their potential benefit to the consumers over the apps that are available.
14. After reading the paper, is the thesis supported?
    a. While only a single study, a worrying conclusion revealed that the phone apps were more accurate in measuring steps taken by the users, possibly disproving the student's thesis, as the existing phone apps can potentially fulfill the niche better, without the need for a dedicated device.
15. What kinds of information, if any, are missing?
    a. The paper could stand to elaborate a little more on the potential impact on the user's health and fitness by expressing, or even emphasizing what the devices have over existing apps. There is no real mitigation or consideration in place, or at least heavily emphasized, for risk factors that sound like they could very well make the emerging devices irrelevant.
16. What was the single most important thing said in the paper?
    a. "As said in the article by Karen Smith, even though there are trackers out there, everything the tracker does your smartphone can do too through apps." I feel the paper needs to really push what makes the trackers special a little harder. The student has already revealed the supposed incredibly long life that the trackers tend to have on average, compared to smart phones, but it could stand to emphasize the devices and what innovations they bring a little more.