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?  
   No formal experimenta results have been included yet
2. Does the paper support the results as claimed? (Overall)
   1. Absolutely. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
   2. Not really, because: No results included, but this has been taken into consideration in the writing and reviewing.
3. Does the title orient the reader to the field and distinguish this paper from others in the field?
   1. Absolutely. Comments: Excellent title. Short, descriptive and clean.
   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: Click or tap here to enter text.
   2. Not really, because: Abstract is a little bit sparse. Consider introduce the ideas of “vortices” and how we can quantify them as physicists. What are their properties? How do they behave? They describe how we use them to simulate weather systems.
5. Does the introduction provide context and motivation for the experiment and state the results?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Introducing is very strong, and clear outlines the goals for the lab. Excellenet use of quotes and citations.
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: Paper reads and flows well. Consider breaking sections into paragraphs to make feel less continuous.
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 summary of conclusion included.
8. Do the equations support the text?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: No explicity equations are explained. I recommended adding a paragraph in the introduction explaining how we can quantitfy properties of vortices.
9. Are the figures useful and of good quality?
   1. Yes  No
   2. Comments/Suggestions: Excellent figures. Consider making the captions more descriptive.
10. Does the series of figures reflect the storyline of the text?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Click or tap here to enter text.
11. Do the figures have sufficient captions and labels to understand them?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Revise captions
12. Are the references cited correctly?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Nice job using sources and working them into the text.
13. Are the references useful to the reader?
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Relevant and organized.
14. The paper was engaging
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Very well written, clean grammar and has a very professional fell.
15. The writing was clear
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Strutured well and ideas came clearly.
16. I understood the physics
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Not too much quantitative physics was included – as expected fort a draft.
17. The paper gave me a good perspective on the topic
    1. Yes  No
    2. Comments/Suggestions: Solid introduction and procedure layed out.
18. Other Comments/Suggestions: Nice work!
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)