

## REVIEW of PAPER # 16 BY REVIEWER # 17

Fill in each \_\_\_\_\_ with a number on a scale of 1-5.

(1=Poor) (2=Fair) (3=Acceptable) (4=Good) (5=Excellent)

1. Presentation: 3

1.1. Organization: 4

1.2 Grammar and spelling: 2

2. Completeness (Strength of Content- Missing key items? ): 4

3. Technical Correctness: 5

4. Proper Referencing: 5

5. "Coolness" / Originality: 3

6. Comments to Author (Suggestions for Improvement):

Your abstract and introduction leaves the premise of the paper as an afterthought. They instead focus on introducing the systems being discussed. Introducing the systems is important; however, that is probably better done after the paper's premise is highlighted. I find that I create a much more helpful introduction by reworking it after writing the rest of the paper.

My Order:

Brainstorm of talking points -> intro draft -> body -> intro modification -> conclusion -> abstract

Related Wisdom:

[http://www.ted.com/talks/uri\\_alon\\_why\\_truly\\_innovative\\_science\\_demands\\_a\\_leap\\_into\\_the\\_unknown#t-292634](http://www.ted.com/talks/uri_alon_why_truly_innovative_science_demands_a_leap_into_the_unknown#t-292634)