

# Final DH Project Peer Review

Instructions: Make sure to complete peer review on the **two peer posts** that follow your own on the forum. Make sure to address your peer's individual essay, incorporating your understanding of the assignment prompt and rubric to guide your responses. **Please answer the DH project questions before you read any project essays. Ideally, we want these projects to standalone without explanation.**

You may be reviewing an essay that speaks to a different project than you reviewed, and that's fine. You should be able to fully grasp the essay without looking at the project, but feel free to pull up the project if needed. **Although not always the case, this may indicate that the peer needs to write more concretely in this area so that a reader doesn't have to review to the project itself.**

Note: If you don't make any specific suggestions for improvement, you won't receive full credit for this review. Likewise, if your tone is not supportive while being critical, you won't receive full credit.

## Essay

1. What is the question that guides the research? Restate it here.
2. What suggestions do you have to improve the question? How could the peer make it a more effective guiding research question and/or more concretely connected to the digital project?
3. What is the thesis of this essay? Restate it here.
4. What suggestions do you have to improve the question? How could the peer make a stronger claim about what the project accomplishes (or attempts to accomplish)? How could this thesis better include rhetorical techniques, critical discussion of the media choices you made, and a connection to the ideological/power system underpinnings of your project?
5. How could the body of the essay better develop a discussion of what was created, why, through what methods, media, and data and/or better explore the practical and ethical reasons for those choices? Make at least 2 concrete suggestions for improvement.
6. What are the most successful examples used to develop these reflective claims?
7. Which claims should be better supported through specific examples from the project and/or research/course readings?
8. According to the essay, how has the peer considered the project's design and goals based on audience?
9. What suggestions do you have for a more thoughtful examination of audience?
10. According to the essay, how has the peer meaningfully engaged and transformed a dataset? Suggestions to better develop this aspect of the essay?
11. Review the peer's use of research and provide at least 3 concrete suggestions to improve academic APA-styled source integration. You might address the fit of the

research to support the peer's claims, the style of integration itself (proper attribution & citation), and/or the requirement of 3 class-based sources.

12. Are there parts of the essay the should better employ direct quotation, paraphrase, and/or summary?
13. Speak to the reflective component of this essay, which should be significant and apparent throughout the essay as a whole. How might the peer improve self-critical insights into:
  - a. Strengths and weaknesses of various project topic, data, and design choices
  - b. Lessons learned from the experience of building a DH project
  - c. Possible further avenues to explore.
14. Read over the reference list and glance at the formatting of the paper as a whole. Make suggestions to improve the formatting and correctness.
15. What should be the biggest priority for revision?
16. What do you think is most successful about this essay? About the project as a whole?