

Peer Review #2

The paper I am reviewing examines the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) security breach. The cover page of this paper is appealing and colorful.

The writing is clear, concise and is written in proper English. The author's paper discusses the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) security breach. In the "Project Overview," the author states that their paper aimed to "examine the breach and to understand what has been done in order to prevent this in the future". This is not exactly a topic that seems easy to take a position on, which the author did not. I believe the author relies too heavily on the references he/she uses. This may be because the author does not take a stance on the topic presented. The author also mentioned that he/she will "[examine...] the legislature that is currently available to agencies and their effort to protect personal information," but it doesn't seem like this topic was covered. The author also uses informal phrases such as "I have read up on" instead of "research shows..." or "my findings show...", which would make the paper seem more professional.

The author only included six out of the required ten references. The in-text citations accurately correspond with the reference section. The author mainly used news articles and other articles to write his/her paper. I believe that the author should use more academic journals and books as a basis for his/her research instead of news websites and other websites that are not academic sources. The use of non-academic sources does not reflect adequate research effort – it makes it seem like the author simply performed a google search on the matter and found the information (I'm not saying this is what actually happened, but this is what the references used conveys).

The author does not include any tables or figures in his/her paper. Perhaps the author could use more tables to show a visual representation of all of the numbers he/she discusses in his/her paper. Tables and/or figures may also help the author extend the length of his/her paper.

The paper does not conform to the guidelines in the course syllabus. There are several sections missing from this paper including: Client, Resources, and Work to be applied by others. In addition to this, the “Faculty Advisor” section is relatively short and does not include Dr. Murphy’s qualifications.

I believe that the topic should be altered a little in order to make it possible for the author to take a position on the issue. Taking a position on the issue will allow the author to show more of an understanding of the topic and it may also help lengthen the paper. It is unclear what the author is trying to prove through his/her research. Therefore, I can’t say whether or not the topic can be completed in a semester because as of now, it seems as if it is completed unless the author adjusts the topic to allow him/her to take a stance on the topic.

The paper did not meet the page requirements. There are only four pages of written text, rather than the required eight pages. Perhaps this could be lengthened with the inclusion of the author’s own views, tables and/or figures, the addition of the missing sections, and the additional references.

The paper did not really reflect the author’s understanding of the topic because of the heavy use of references. A reference is used in almost every sentence and there is really nowhere in the paper where I can see the author’s own thoughts, position, or understanding of the topic. The author did not expand upon other works, but perhaps the paper is unfinished. The author mentioned that the investigation of the security breach is still underway, so that may be why

he/she does not have much of a position on the matter. As a reviewer, I gained more basic knowledge about the OPM but nothing that has not been reported on the news websites.

In conclusion, I believe that the topic is interesting but it does not allow the author to take a stance and defend his/her position. It is more of a simple summary of the OPM breach, with no real thesis or position on the matter. Because the investigation of the matter is still underway, perhaps the author should consider changing his/her topic to something that will allow him/her to give more of an opinion on the matter.