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]

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 explict 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 comparisions that would boost their intellectual signficance?
- Any discussion points that they should add?
- *You are not obligated to provide more than two pages* (i.e., don't correcting 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