This cover sheet should help you read and review a classmate’s lab report draft and give feedback to the author.

For grading your peer review: 2 points for Questions 1-19, 2 points for Question 20.

1. What are the main results of the experiment?  
   As of current there are no formal experimental results.
2. Does the paper support the results as claimed? (Overall)
   1. Absolutely. Comments: The paper acknowledges that there are no results and is clear that the author is currently working on them and has a plan in place.
   2. Not really, because: Click or tap here to enter text.
3. Does the title orient the reader to the field and distinguish this paper from others in the field?
   1. Absolutely. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
   2. Not really, because: It says nothing on black hole merger events.
4. Does the abstract orient the reader to the experiment and state the results?
   1. Absolutely. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
   2. Not really, because: Again, no results, but the abstract does orient the reader to the experiment. I like how the author presents the work and how the work is accomplished in the abstract, all they need to do is finish the results and include them.
5. Does the introduction provide context and motivation for the experiment and state the results?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Again, no results, and it says at the bottom, this introduction is very not finished. Could use some more motivation in the introduction in addition to the better comprehension of the behavior of gravitational waves.
6. Does the paper have a logical flow of arguments and information that is easily followed by the reader?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: While there needs to be more added, such as equations and data, I like the flow in how to find the proper fit function and results.
7. Does the summary/conclusion restate the results and state their significance within the context of the field?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: No conclusion.
8. Do the equations support the text?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: While there are more equations needed, the fit function one looks good and it explained well. It is also quite clever using t-t\_m, nice job!
9. Are the figures useful and of good quality?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Currently no figures.
10. Does the series of figures reflect the storyline of the text?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Currently no figures.
11. Do the figures have sufficient captions and labels to understand them?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Currently no figures.
12. Are the references cited correctly?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Nice job!
13. Are the references useful to the reader?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Used this one as well.
14. The paper was engaging
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: While is it still very much just a frame of what it is to be, I found what was there to be the proper form of a lab report.
15. The writing was clear
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Not much to say here, it written in a direct manner and there was not much fluff.
16. I understood the physics
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Again, I know that there is not much there and you will be expanding it but definitely go more into GR and the actual process of how LIGO works. Basically explain the Michelson-Morely experiment and how LIGO is a beefed up version of it.
17. The paper gave me a good perspective on the topic
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Good overview, needs finer details. It would be nice to get the actual nuts and bolts on the black hole merger events and also give some background on the topic. Maybe even a little history too on how we got to where we were in the early 20th century to where we are now. How has our understanding changed over the last century?
18. Other Comments/Suggestions: I like what is here, and I am sure you have plans on how to expand it. There are some grammatical errors that will be in the mark up but other than that it is a good start. I would definitely hop on it though, it took me forever to get the fit function down for multiple data sets and we only have 2 weeks until the final submission. Good luck Landon!
19. Recommendation (Choose one):
    1. Accept  Minor Revision  Major Revision  Reject
    2. Accept = Document is ready for publication
    3. Minor Revision = Document is most ready for publication but requires minor changes
    4. Major Revision = Document is interesting but requires significant changes before publication
    5. Reject = Document is missing important results and context and should not be published in its current form
20. Comments and mark-up of the author’s paper (on MyCourses)