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## **Part I: Nathan Loveless**

Summarize the review and comments you gave to your peer. You will need to do this for each proposal that you review (i.e., twice). Be sure to state the name of the person you are reviewing.

#### **Queston 1**

Did you feel that the proposal you graded was complete in terms of length, and that it demonstrated a genuine effort on your peer's part. If not, explain what you felt was lacking.

* I think it was complete in length and it was not too long. I think there was a lot of thought that was put into it and that it represents a genuine effort on Nathan’s part.

#### **Question 2**

Briefly summarize the overarching objective and hypothesis of the reviewed proposal.

* The overarching objective is to examine possible mechanisms or triggers of extinction and how a non-dominant species respond to different levels of dominance in an ecosystem. The hypothesis is that since competition increases extinction rate, there will be higher rates of extinction among the non-dominant species.

#### **Question 3**

Does the hypothesis meet the following criteria in your estimation? If not, explain why.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is coherent and understandable?

I think that it is understandable but I think it might be helpful to state specifically which taxa will be considered.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is novel?

I don’t think the hypothesis is novel right now, but if previously unstudied taxa from a specific location is studied, I believe it can be novel.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is testable/feasible?

Yes, definitely, using the Paleobiology Database.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is scientifically or socially relevant?

It is very relevant socially because there is a high modern rate of extinction.

#### **Question 4**

Summarize the areas where you felt that the proposal could be improved.

I think that this proposal can be most improved in the first three paragraphs. The language used was very general and I think it would benefit from more concrete examples of studies that people have already carried out. It could also include some questions/problems that other people have encountered. I think that a few things are overstated a bit too much (for example, that conservation is important) and the paper could be more concise if repetitions were left out.

#### **Question 5**

What constructive criticism did you provide to your peer to address the areas that needed improvement?

(Answered above)

#### **Question 6**

Did you feel that this proposal made an adequate use of citation and background research? If not, what additional information did you want to see?

Additional information I would be curious to know about is what kinds of studies have been previously conducted, and what those studies found that might be relevant to this research.

## **Part II**

Summarize your response to your peers' reviews of your proposal. You will need to do this once for each review you receive. State who was your reviewer.

#### **Question 1**

Did the reviewer clearly understand your hypothesis? If not, what will you do to make it clearer?

Yes my hypothesis was understood.

#### **Question 2**

Did the reviewer feel that your proposed project was scientifically or socially relevant? If not, how will you improve it?

The reviewer didn’t mention this, but I think it is relevant since it investigates the impact to climate.

#### **Question 3**

Did the reviewer approve of your proposed analytical methods? If not, how will you improve them?

He felt that I should be more specific in describing my techniques (for example, what did I mean by “statistical methods”?)

#### **Question 4**

Do you feel that your reviewer did an adequate and thorough job in their review? How could they have improved their review?

Yes I think Adam did a great job.

#### **Question 5**

In general, what steps will you now take to improve your proposal?

I’ll be more specific in my methods. I’ll also rewrite it as a large paragraph instead of with headings.

## **Part I: Adam Watson**

Summarize the review and comments you gave to your peer. You will need to do this for each proposal that you review (i.e., twice). Be sure to state the name of the person you are reviewing.

#### **Queston 1**

Did you feel that the proposal you graded was complete in terms of length, and that it demonstrated a genuine effort on your peer's part. If not, explain what you felt was lacking.

Yes I think this is a great proposal.

#### **Question 2**

Briefly summarize the overarching objective and hypothesis of the reviewed proposal.

Adam wanted to investigate the effects of the establishment of the Antarctic cirumpolar current using several proxies such as d18O and d13C.

#### **Question 3**

Does the hypothesis meet the following criteria in your estimation? If not, explain why.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is coherent and understandable?

Yes.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is novel?

There has been a lot of research on this topic but I don’t know enough about it myself to know whether it’s novel.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is testable/feasible?

I think that it might be, although I think it’s a lot to cover for just one study. The study should be narrowed down a little more.

* Do you believe that this hypothesis is scientifically or socially relevant?

Yes, definitely, because it investigates a potential cause for climate change which is a very relevant social and scientific issue today.

#### **Question 4**

Summarize the areas where you felt that the proposal could be improved.

I think that the main area that this study could be improved is if Adam specified which proxies he was going to use as well as if he identified a more specific region to study.

#### **Question 5**

What constructive criticism did you provide to your peer to address the areas that needed improvement?

I think I told him it might be nice to mention more specific study sites and maybe why he chose them.

#### **Question 6**

Did you feel that this proposal made an adequate use of citation and background research? If not, what additional information did you want to see?

Yes, there was enough background information in this proposal. Maybe a bit more on thermohaline circulation and what it is?

## **Part II**

Summarize your response to your peers' reviews of your proposal. You will need to do this once for each review you receive. State who was your reviewer.

#### **Question 1**

Did the reviewer clearly understand your hypothesis? If not, what will you do to make it clearer?

Adam told me he understood my hypothesis.

#### **Question 2**

Did the reviewer feel that your proposed project was scientifically or socially relevant? If not, how will you improve it?

He also said he felt it was socially/scientifically relevant.

#### **Question 3**

Did the reviewer approve of your proposed analytical methods? If not, how will you improve them?

He said I would need to be more specific when I write about my methods and not assume that other people already know what my methods are.

#### **Question 4**

Do you feel that your reviewer did an adequate and thorough job in their review? How could they have improved their review?

Yes, I’m glad I spoke with Adam. He didn’t only give me critique but he also gave me some other good ideas I can work on.

#### **Question 5**

In general, what steps will you now take to improve your proposal?

I’ll definitely be more specific when I talk about the methods I’ll use. I’ll also make sure that I correctly format the proposal.