

Nathaniel Welch

CSC 300

2/7/11

Peer Review 1 - Natalia Tupy

Natalia's paper seemed pretty straight forward to me. Her topic is whether or not the UCITA is ethical. She focuses a lot on the documentation that companies provide and when/how they notify customers of defects in their software. The SE code sections she picked support this and back her conclusion that the UCITA is unethical.

What I do not understand at all in her paper though, is how her analysis section is organized. She restates the same information three times for each section of the Software Engineering code. It is very confusing and does not flow well at all. Instead of writing about the SE code, then rephrasing it and then using it in an argument conclusion, she should reorganize so that her statements about the UCITA go first, then her explanation of the SE code and how it relates. There is no need to restate the SE code section twice, it just confuses the reader.

As for her per-argument conclusion section, I would merge them all into a single conclusion at the very end and remove the tables. A simple paragraph that explains the key points of how each of the SE Code sections would remind the reader at the end of her paper about exactly what had been talked about for the last one thousand words and summarize the paper nicely.

Another small but noticeable issue with Natalia's paper is her constant use of "I". When reading a research paper, I can assume that the whole article is tilted with the

author's biases and beliefs. Instead of opening sentences with "I think" and "I believe", just lay it to me straight. Which sounds more believable?

"I believe the UCITA is unethical," or

"The UCITA is unethical because..."

The second one of course. She should show her reader that she really believes in her results and remove every "I action" in her paper. It will make the whole thing much stronger.

Her sources seem legit. I wish she had a wider variety of sources though. Two of the six sources are from CNET, with the interviews done by the same guy. I feel like there is a slight bias in both of them. I am glad she lists the UCITA website though. That seems to have a solid place for quotes and citations.

Her paper seems well researched and thought about, but it definitely needs work. I think a better organizational layout could help a ton. Also, she is doing quotes wrong everywhere in the paper, which is kind of distracting. Good luck Natalia, it sounds like you have a solid paper here.