

The goals of peer review are 1) to help improve your classmate's paper by pointing out strengths and weaknesses that may not be apparent to the author, and 2) to help improve your own editing skills.

*Instructions:* Read the papers assigned to you twice, once to get an overview of the paper, and a second time to provide constructive criticism for the author to use when revising his/her paper. Answer the questions below. Please submit separate pdf documents of your responses to the questions below for each DAR you evaluate. Use a naming convention with the DAR paper number, for example DAR123.pdf.

### *Organization*

1. Were the basic sections (Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusion) adequate? If not, what is missing?
  - a. Missing: model selection, inferences, and conclusions.
  - b. Possibly include diagnostics
2. Was the material ordered in a way that was logical, clear, and easy to follow?
  - a. Good start. Finish strong!
3. Could the clarity or efficiency be improved by changes in the order of the paper? Are there portions of the text that could be omitted?
  - a. What do each of the predictors mean?

### *Grammar and Style*

4. Were there any grammatical or spelling problems?
  - a. "there" vs "their" vs "they're"
  - b. Chi=squared
5. Was the writer's writing style clear? Were the paragraphs and sentences cohesive and logically explicated? Briefly provide specific examples for your response.
  - a. You might want to proof read what you already got. Grammar is killing you.

### *Content:*

"Explain" may be interpreted as "What is missing?" and "What could be deleted?" and "What is accomplished well?"

6. Did the writer adequately state the problem and place it into context? Explain.
  - a. Problem was stated, and context was there.
7. Did the writer successfully use tables and figures to clarify the exposition and forward the story line? Were figures or tables improperly/incompletely labeled or captioned, or not appropriately cited/interpreted in the text? Be specific.
  - a. There were no tables and figures except for the ones in the appendix.  
Good work on referring to those.

8. Were model choices well justified? Were the inferences drawn appropriate from the chosen model? Explain.
  - a. Needed a model section.
9. Did the writer adequately interpret inferences and accurately summarize results? Explain.
  - a. Missing this section.
10. Does the abstract *concisely and clearly* summarize the whole data analysis project, including the findings? What could be added or deleted?
  - a. -Under Construction-

*Overall summary:*

11. Which part of the paper is the most effective? *Why?*
  - a. *EDA, starting the process on what's about to happen.*
12. Which part of the paper is the least effective? *Why?*
  - a. *Missing half the paper.*
  - b. *Grammar is killing the rest of this paper.*