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?  
   Results not yet completed, but good progress has been made
2. Does the paper support the results as claimed? (Overall)
   1. Absolutely. Comments: The start of the report indicates a solid progression of events that will point to the results as predicted.
   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: Yes, title is short, and useful
   2. Not really, because: Click or tap here to enter text.
4. Does the abstract orient the reader to the experiment and state the results?
   1. Absolutely. Comments: Abstract is short, consider adding more detail when the report is finished
   2. Not really, because: Click or tap here to enter text.
5. Does the introduction provide context and motivation for the experiment and state the results?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Strong start of introduction, and the nature of the problem. Conider braking it up into a paragraphs. Right now, its one block of tect with now “breaths” for transitions
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: Progression and flow is strong, but dense.
7. Does the summary/conclusion restate the results and state their significance within the context of the field?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Conclusion not yet finished.
8. Do the equations support the text?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Yes, Equation is well introduced and supports written details, consider an elaboration or a more direct integrationg into results.
9. Are the figures useful and of good quality?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Clean figures, adjust the formatting/white spacings,, and rotate by 90 degrees.
10. Does the series of figures reflect the storyline of the text?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Figures are placed chronologically, and support the order of written text to provide context.
11. Do the figures have sufficient captions and labels to understand them?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Yes, figure has a descriptive title, and neatly shows the experimental setup
12. Are the references cited correctly?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Yes, need to add more references, to support some of your claims
13. Are the references useful to the reader?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: minimal references, consider adding more
14. The paper was engaging
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Well written, excellent flow, converying a lot of good information.
15. The writing was clear
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Nice flow of events easy to read.
16. I understood the physics
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Solid use a basic rotational kinematics, introduced in a very clean way
17. The paper gave me a good perspective on the topic
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Ideas were well layed out, and interesting!
18. Other Comments/Suggestions: Click or tap here to enter text.
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)