**Jessyca Peer Review**

I think that Jessyca did a phenomenal job with her programming and analysis. Looking at the code, she had all the model comparisons, she had more than enough of the data to back up her conclusion and discussion, she was able to really bring her project together, and I think that she should give herself some more credit in terms about talking about her project (because god knows I talk a big game, but mine wasn’t great). In terms of code, I think that her files could’ve maybe have been a bit more organized, and that she could’ve used the ‘source’ function a little more, to really ease the stress of having everything work in the r chunks of the markdown file, but that’s just a matter of ease and simplicity, than it actually being wrong.

That being said, I think that her introduction should have been stronger. I know that there are various terms for stress,and ultimate, penultimate, and so on are not the only terms used across phonology and phonetics, but it definitely seems like a richer description with ‘oxytone’, ‘neutral’ and other terms. I don’t know what neutral would be in this, and she mentions five terms, but doesn’t explain how they relate to the experiment. She later goes on to explain that the experiment used four variations of the nonce words, but if there are five possibilities, why is the fifth left out? Or is neutral to have no stress? Jessyca also goes on to explain that those terms should be looked up for clarification, and while I understand that is important for theoretical background, I think it is more important for her to be able to give a summary of the theoretical framework, and explain how it relates to the experiment. In fact, I think that this is the only weak point of the paper; because she didn’t explain a background or framework for the paper, the interpretation is left up to the writer, when in reality, confirmation is needed from the reader, to ensure viable results. This complaint is minute, though, and really isn’t meant to detract from how good the paper seems to handle the massive amount of data that is seemed to be described.

**Anna Peer Review**

The first thing to say is that Anna’s paper is amazingly thorough. Between Jessyca and Anna, this was really fun for me to read, because they both have well written papers. But where Jessyca did a better job in source code organization (and I know she’s very anal about that), Anna’s is very messy.

I definitely struggled to find a lot of Anna’s stuff. Her coding seems a bit disorganized; more so her file organization, which can definitely be consolidated, and could follow the template that you gave use for a lot of out assignments.

In terms of her paper, I really like her topic. I know that she didn’t collect the data herself, but it would be interesting to do a linguistic comparison to a different language that doesn’t have duration as a phonetic cue, and instead something like intensity (which she actually does reference in the conclusion, so she really does think of it).

I wish I could visualize the model comparisons. I am not a great reader, and I think that it gets a little dense at times with the statistical explanation in the paper (which is obviously needed), but, as I said with Jessyca’s I could give a stronger punch.

I can’t really comment on anything else in Anna’s project; judging by the paper, she has done this before, and really excelled at writing a strong paper, and one that is able to handle the statistics fluidly. Anna’s understanding of experiments and analysis shines in the paper, and something that I am not fully able to appreciate with my novice understanding of it all.