

Submitting Design 3

Marguerite Butler

2023-11-17

Turn in your Design 3

- 1) Please be sure to **name the file using the naming convention FirstAuthorLastName_SecondAuthorLastName.pdf** so that your peers can find the correct paper to review. Be sure to put the first author first.

For example: “*Fisher_Gao.pdf*”

- 2) Post your draft paper on the shared Google Drive by midnight Monday. [[Upload here](#)]

Note: All Design papers are in the **Shared Google Drive > DesignProjects > ...**

Complete your Peer Critique

Reference materials

- Find your [[Review assignment](#)]
- Download your assigned manuscript. [[Design 3 google drive folder](#)].
- [[Design 3 assignment](#)]

Print out the manuscript so that you can write comments directly on the report.

Read through the [content guidelines].

Read your assigned manuscript. Be a good colleague.

- Your main task is to **critique the content** - please go through their **analysis** and look for any improvements that could help. *Catch any errors, and they will be **extremely grateful**.*
- **Identify any cool results to point out or other discussion points that may increase significance.**
- As you go, mark it with brief comments or corrections. *Please do not correct each instance of the same type of error. Just point it out the first time.*
- **Focus on improvements** that would provide the **biggest payoff**. Be explicit it (of course, don't be mean – just state the facts).
- When you receive your critique, it really helps to have a thick skin – we are working together to help each other produce the best final draft possible.

Prepare your ~2 page written critique for the authors. Please submit by Wednesday.

- **Begin your review with a positive statement** before going into problems. A critique is mostly negative – that's just the nature of the beast. As scientists, we are most interested in knowing exactly what is wrong, poorly stated, or unconvincing *so that we can correct it*. But it makes the medicine a little easier to swallow if you start with something nice.
- Write **Major (overall) comments** (about one paragraph). What was the best part of the manuscript? What were the major problems? The most significant shortcomings? Was it well-written and clearly organized?
- Write **Specific comments**. For ideas on what to include for these sections, see Peer Critique guidelines:
 - Content (specific comments on each section)
 - Organization and Structure
 - Style and Grammar
 - Cited References
- In general, pick the most significant comments to write up first.
- Any additional results or comparisons that would boost their intellectual significance?
- Any discussion points that they should add?
- *You are not obligated to provide more than two pages (i.e., don't correct every little thing, just point out on the first instance, and let the authors learn from finding the rest).*

- Evaluate **Effectiveness of Collaboration**. Did each partner contribute significantly and more or less equally? (can be as short as one sentence, but please elaborate if you need to).
- Focus on **specific comments related to content**. However, if there are problems in other areas, please tell them clearly.

Assign a numeric grade based on a 100% maximum scale.

It should be weighted (approximately) 60% Content, 20% Organization & Structure, 10% Style and Grammar, and 10% Cited References.

The grade you give will not affect their grade at all. But will help clarify for everyone how papers are evaluated. Help them get a better grade by being clear so that the final version can be as strong as possible.

Your peer-review grade (10 pts) will be based on the **quality of your critique**, including the reasonableness of the grade you assign.

Submit by EMAIL to the two AUTHORS with cc to me

Give the **One marked up copy of the paper** to the authors,

Thanks! Marguerite