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.

* What are the main results of the experiment?  
    
    
  The experiment does not yet have any results
* Does the paper support the results as claimed? (Overall)
* Absolutely. Comments:
* Not really, because:
* Choice C: there is no agreement or conflict as no results have been discussed
* Does the title orient the reader to the field and distinguish this paper from others in the field?
* Absolutely. Comments:
* Not really, because: It is very basic, however the author knows this given that there is a note that they will improve the title later.
* Does the abstract orient the reader to the experiment and state the results?
* Absolutely. Comments: Putting in this category becuase it does a good job of laying the foundation. Once results are obtained and entered I think it will be an effective abstract.
* Not really, because:
* Does the introduction provide context and motivation for the experiment and state the results?
* Yes No \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: It does a good intro to the topic with good orienting details. There is motivation listed, which would be to understand the behavior of gw and binary black hole systems but I am not sure that is complete. Again, no results so not a whole lot to add here.
* Does the paper have a logical flow of arguments and information that is easily followed by the reader?
* Yes No Mostly \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: The abstract and intro are very digestable. The explanation of the power spectral density is lacking, or, perhaps I just don't understand it at all so I am not a good audience.
* Does the summary/conclusion restate the results and state their significance within the context of the field?
* Yes No Inconclusive \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: No conclusion or summary included
* Do the equations support the text?
* Yes \*checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions: Only 1 equation but it fits
* Are the figures useful and of good quality?
* Yes No Inconclusive \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: No figures
* Does the series of figures reflect the storyline of the text?
* Yes No Inconclusive \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: no figures
* Do the figures have sufficient captions and labels to understand them?
* Yes No Inconclusive \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: no figures
* Are the references cited correctly?
* Yes \*checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions: Yup
* Are the references useful to the reader?
* Yes \*checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions: I would add some more references of the where the started code was found
* The paper was engaging
* Yes &checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions: especially the start and the end. The start of the expierimental methodology was just drier to read for some reason. Maybe less use of the word 'we'? That might be it, but It might be something else I cannot tell.
* The writing was clear
* Yes \*checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions: Good to follow.Thumbs up.
* I understood the physics
* Yes No Mostly \*checkmark
* Comments/Suggestions: Why do you use the reciprocal of the power spectral density? Also how will you adress the changing frequency of the inpiral to merger?
* The paper gave me a good perspective on the topic
* Yes \*checkmark No
* Comments/Suggestions:
* Other Comments/Suggestions:   
   I chose minor revision mainly because there is a lot missing from the report but what is included is solid.
* Recommendation (Choose one):
* Accept \*Minor Revision Major Revision Reject
* Accept = Document is ready for publication
* Minor Revision = Document is most ready for publication but requires minor changes
* Major Revision = Document is interesting but requires significant changes before publication
* Reject = Document is missing important results and context and should not be published in its current form
* Comments and mark-up of the author’s paper (on MyCourses)