Checkpoint 3: Peer review 1
Due Monday Oct 21 at noon

Objective:

The goal of this checkpoint is to provide constructive feedback on three of your peers' outlines from Checkpoint 2. You will assess their paper selection and the structure of their proposed *News & Views* articles, focusing on how well they plan to engage a general audience while maintaining scientific depth.

Tasks:

1. **Evaluate Paper Selection (for each outline):**
   Review whether the author has chosen a paper with compelling findings and broader significance. Consider if the selected paper presents interesting implications for the field or society at large. Additionally, evaluate whether the chosen paper can be explained clearly to a general audience without losing important scientific details.

2. **Assess the Introduction (for each outline):**
   Examine if the introduction effectively hooks the reader by explaining the broader context in an engaging way. Assess whether the introduction sets up the research problem or question clearly for a non-expert audience, and provide feedback on how well it balances accessibility with depth.

3. **Review the Summary of Key Findings (for each outline):**
   Evaluate whether the outline presents a concise and clear summary of the research findings. Check if complex ideas are simplified without oversimplifying the science and whether the most interesting or surprising findings are highlighted. Suggest improvements for making the findings more engaging or clearer for a general audience.

4. **Evaluate Broader Implications (for each outline):**
   Assess how well the outline explains the connection of the research to larger questions or its broader impact on the field or society. Determine if the author mentions any potential future work or practical applications, and provide feedback on how effectively the outline engages readers with the research's significance.

5. **Assess the Conclusion (for each outline):**
Determine if the conclusion effectively ties together the article's main points and leaves the reader with a sense of why the research matters. Check if the conclusion includes a forward-looking statement that encourages curiosity about future developments, and suggest improvements to make the conclusion more compelling and reflective of the article's key messages.

6. **Evaluate the Emphasis on *News & Views* Style (for each outline):**
Evaluate the clarity of the outline, focusing on whether it shows a plan to write clearly and engage non-experts. Check if the outline maintains a good balance between accessibility and depth, and whether the article can keep readers engaged. Suggest ways to make the outline more engaging, such as including surprising facts, real-world relevance, or thought-provoking questions.

7. **AI Use:*** Evaluate whether the outline is primarily human-written or if AI was used appropriately as a writing partner. If the outline feels original and personal, with AI perhaps assisting in structure or grammar, score it highly. If it seems overly formal, generic, or disconnected from the student's own voice, it may be mostly AI-generated.

Submission and Evaluation:

- **Submission:** Use Perusall to review and comment on the three outlines you have been assigned. As you read through each outline, add specific comments and suggestions directly on the document. Ensure your comments cover each section (Introduction, Summary of Key Findings, Broader Implications, Conclusion) as well as the overall engagement and *News & Views* style.

- **Evaluation:** Your peers will use your comments to revise their outlines for their *News & Views* articles. Focus on whether they are meeting the dual goals of clarity and depth, and if their outlines show a clear plan for engaging a non-expert audience.