Unit 1 Sample Peer Reviews

Instructor's note: Both of these peer reviews received check or check plus grades. Although the peer reviewer in example #2 uses the first person ("I"), they avoid using the second person, referring to the writer in the third person throughout.

Example #1

This paper provides an analysis of the GBMP website and examines the specific writing styles displayed throughout the site. Through the discussion of language, audience, and goals of the organization, the author is able to decipher the overall purpose of the website. The author has provided a good foundation for further discussion of a popular discourse community.

Although goals of lean are mentioned throughout the paper, it lacks a concrete definition of the term, which may cause confusion for a reader without any background in it. A simple definition discussing the purpose of lean (process improvement) would be helpful in the first paragraph. The paper could benefit from a stronger analysis of what the site reveals about the specific discourse community. There is an opportunity to draw a connection between the genre of the work and the qualities and expectations of the community. The flow of the paper could be improved by moving the paragraphs that mention intended audience and thesis of the site after the summary. The paper could then go on to discuss how the language and tone support the initial conclusions.

The paper has minimal grammatical errors, none of which inhibit comprehension of the paper. There are a few opportunities to improve upon clarity of the paper's message. The second to last paragraph of the paper seems to contradict itself. The first sentence

states that "There are limited advertisements on the GBMP website." but then goes on to say that "the website is an advertisement itself." Removal of the first sentence would still allow the point of the paragraph to be made. With alterations, this paper will be able to effectively provide information about the discourse community targeted by GBMP's website.

Example #2

Student X's paper discusses and analyzes a journal called Transactions on Networking. Before analyzing his source, X first draws attention to its integrity by pointing out a number of organizations in the field of electrical engineering often site or refer to this journal. He then explains what the journal is by stating "it is a collection of papers submitted by various members of the" electrical/computer engineering and computer science communities. Afterwards, he analyzes the language of the journal by mentioning its purpose and discussing the credibility of its authors. X continues to dissect the journal and confers that as a whole it does not have a thesis, but the individual articles themselves do. He addresses that the journal's audience has a varying degree of knowledge in the electrical/computer engineering and computer science communities; however, they have a technical background nonetheless. Finally, he concludes that Transactions on Networking is a "fitting example" of how people in his field communicate.

First I'd like to compliment the fact that X has surely engaged the assignment. He answers the questions of how the journal uses language, what kinds of writing are associated with the engineering community, who the audience is, and it's specific purpose. He even makes an observation that "a single member of the community would not necessarily be interested in an entire volume of the

journal" rather just a subset of it. One of my major concerns is the final paragraph. He mentions "While their uses of languages throughout the publications may show differences from section to section, the differences show a common, repeating pattern in each edition of the journal that characterizes the members of produce it." I'm not sure if I follow this final statement because he didn't really discuss the journal in terms of a pattern. It doesn't seem to conclude the rest of his essay. Also, I feel that the last sentence in the second paragraph doesn't fit. It seems as though it should be the last statement of the first paragraph because he speaks about the journal's credibility.

For the most part, I believe X's paper is successfully executed. However, there are a few minor details that need some revision. For example, I noticed that there were some inconsistencies with the type of communities the journal appeals to. In the beginning of his paper, he states the electrical engineering, computer engineering, and the computer science communities. But as the paper continues to discuss communities, the computer science field is no longer mentioned as a community. Also there is one place where the word choices may have been a bit questionable. The second to last paragraph's last sentence uses the word "culture" that community members belong to. Yet, I feel he may have meant the "varying degrees of expertise" or the "diverse skill set" of the members.