

Peer Review 2

The drafted research on PicReport or PR was very clear and concise. I didn't find myself confused or lost throughout reading the paper. Grammatically I didn't find any errors and applaud the writer on his/her writing. The only thing I think you should fix is this sentence: "The idea behind PR is to help first - responders and military personnel collect descriptive information for reports quickly from witnesses by using a series of images rather than through verbal description alone." I'm not sure if it's considered a run-on sentence or not but splitting it up into two sentences would provide a better flow. The paper was very logical, to the point, and easy to follow. Everything seemed to be in order in the way in which it was written. I thought you were doing a good job at stating your case until I found a contradiction. If you look at your thesis which is: "The thesis for this capstone project is that an image based reporting tool can be effective in expediting the collection of information by law enforcement in situations where their subjects are unable to articulate themselves." And then comparing it with another statement made: "These points prove that PR will not be a magical solution, but it will serve as another tool that interviewers may use when it is appropriate to do so." It makes the reader wonder where you stand on whether it's an effective solution or not. I think it's important you make it clear and known on which side of things you stand on. If you think it is effective like you say, you need to do a better job at stating why with supported evidence. You should try and make it sound like a "magical solution" especially because it's a product that you eventually want people to start using and implementing at work.

The required 10 references are present in the References section of the paper. The only reference that was not referred to at least once throughout the text was the second reference listed. I am able to determine which reference a citation in the text is referring to. I do think the references presented are adequate but I think the writer should find more. I think more references providing insight as to why this application can be more effective in expediting information gathering will make the paper have a stronger argument.

Even though this is a research paper I don't think adding some tables and figures would be a bad thing. Readers enjoy pictures and it helps paint a picture of what you're trying to convey if the material can be a bit complex. In your case, I think you can add some figures of what you want your application to look like or pictures of the examples you mentioned. As far as the format goes there was only one section missing which was the "work to be performed by others".

In my opinion, I think the topic can be completed in one semester. The research has already been narrowed down as the writer mentions in the beginning of the paper in order for the task/research to be feasible. Some items that I think should be worth discussing in the paper is how the application is going to operate. Does the application need Wi-Fi? If so, how is this going to be useful for military personnel located in remote areas of the world. If it does operate on Wi-Fi, how secure will the application be? Would it be possible for a criminal to find out if you're coming on to them or to find out who snitched on them? Also because everyone reading this won't be a technical reader I think it's important to explain what words like "wireframe" mean and anything else that the typical reader

wouldn't easily catch on to. I don't think the existing results make your case too strong. You mentioned yourself that it wasn't a magical solution so I think you should do some more research and find sources that align with your stance. Maybe finding more research on memory recall and whether pictures cause better retrieval of memories. You're off to a good start but need more supportive evidence. Also I think it's important to mention that so far this paper has led me to believe that this application would be useful only whenever there was a language barrier. I would like to know why it would be beneficial with individuals that speak the same language. For example, let's say I was a witness to a car theft and an officer was sent on the scene to ask me questions. He then asked me what color, I say silver, and then asks the model/make and I didn't catch it. He would then try to maybe figure out the body of the car. Maybe he asks was it a coupe or sedan. It's very possible that one could get confused and report the wrong body type. I think in a situation like this where there's no language barrier PR would become useful.

The paper did meet the length requirements and as I've mentioned before was very clear and concise therefore there was no redundancy. The important sections were lengthy as it should be and the less important ones were limited to a paragraph, which was good.

It's evident the author knows what he/she is talking about because the paper was thorough in explaining the product. The author did expand and build an application based off previous ones. The author clearly explained their personal ideas and how the application even came to be an idea. All in all the draft was very good and just needs a bit more supportive research to make a stronger argument.