

## **Project Draft Peer Review: Link between Technology and ADD/ADHD**

### **Writing**

The writing in the project draft was very well done in my view. When reading the paper I had no problem understanding any sentence constructions. The author does reveal their stance as to which side they are choosing and the paper is not going for an open-ended question that it starts with in the project title. After reading the paper I did not see any grammatical errors that I could spot after reading or any that pops out. The suggestion that I did have was that some sentences were long and were hard to follow with the idea completely without re-reading the sentences again. I also felt that the quotes were long, if the author could break it up or rephrase it in his own words I believe that it would add to the experience of the reader. The other suggestion I had was with the in text citations. I believe the author should put the full stop after the reference and not in the quotes itself.

### **References**

The author has showed that they have made extensive and thorough research into the topic and I believe they have found very good and dependable sources to support their thesis. The author clearly shows which in-text citations refer to which bibliography entries and there are no confusions as how to find these entries. The author has included the required amount of references for the paper.

## Tables and Figures

The author did include a diagram to show one of the results of the research that was done that was cited in the paper. This did add help in understanding visually what was said in words and added to put a value on how much the difference or comparison was in the results of the study. I feel that if the author adds some more diagrams or tables to show the results of the studies cited in the paper it would help to visually aid the reader and truly see the differences expressed in the results.

## Format

Reading the paper and comparing it to the course syllabus and the requirements for the project draft I could say that the author has followed the requirements. The only difference is that they have given their own sections to the paper and moved some parts around, as it would make sense to the flow of how the paper was written. Other than that the author has stuck to the requirements and has included everything that need to be added in the first draft.

## Topic

The topic the author selected was really interesting. I had my own personal beliefs with regard to ADD/ADHD but it was refreshing to read a different take on it. I believe that the argument that the author took up is not too narrow or wide but just the right enough to have the project completed within the time frame. The scope of the topic might look like it can broaden without limit but I believe the

author has done a good job in making sure that the paper does not stray away from the original argument or thesis stated in the paper.

The only suggestion I might have for the author with regard to the topic and the paper is that the author has not included any opposing views. The author has done a thorough job in providing facts that do support his thesis and made points. Though, I do believe if they were to add one or two arguments from the opposing view and show why these points might or might not be wrong would give the reader the sense that the paper did look at other views and that the paper isn't just one sided.

## **Length**

The author has met the requirements set for the length of the paper. I think there are some topics that can be expanded or taken out, for example the study about Internet addictions. Although the author stated that it does not have direct link with attention disorders, I believe the author might need to explain how it affects attention disorders indirectly so as to support the author's thesis. I feel that it is taking away from the build up the author has put in the previous sections and the section that follows that make the author's thesis or argument.

## **Intellectual Content**

Reading this paper I can see that the author does have knowledge about the brain and about the topic. It shows in their paper by the use of their words and how

they convey their arguments and present their research. The paper shows that a lot of thought and preparation went into the topic. The author used the research to strengthen their argument and thesis, and it did support the author's topic. The only thing I would like to add is that I feel if the author broke up the cited work into smaller pieces, it would engage the readers more. When finally said and done, I did learn new things after reading the paper, it was not hard to follow and it had an entertaining insight into a behavior I can personally relate to, which was 'Just Google it'.