

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. All sections were there.
2. Was the material ordered in a way that was logical, clear, and easy to follow?
 - a. Yes.
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. It was a little bit wordy.

Grammar and Style

4. Were there any grammatical or spelling problems?
 - a. Not many if any.
 - b. You're missing periods throughout the paper. Mostly at the end of the paragraphs.
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. Please avoid using we in the paper.
 - b. Use //qqquad for indenting. It works in latex and sweave.

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. The problem was stated in both abstract and intro. I personally would like if the problem were stated in different styles or reworded differently between the two sections.
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. Was table 1 needed in the paper?
 - b. Explain figure one a little more
- 8. Were model choices well justified? Were the inferences drawn appropriate from the chosen model? Explain.
 - a. I'm going to guess the model was dpros, psa, and gleason predicts capsule
- 9. Did the writer adequately interpret inferences and accurately summarize results? Explain.
 - a. It was nice. The inference parts had pretty good explanations on their odds ratio. Though please review the odds ratio video.
- 10. Does the abstract *concisely and clearly* summarize the whole data analysis project, including the findings? What could be added or deleted?
 - a. Maybe include or hint at the predictions? (missing predictions)
 - b. Include something about the number of nodules affecting penetration of capsule.

Overall summary:

- 11. Which part of the paper is the most effective? *Why?*
 - a. *The inference was good. It clearly explained all results that came from the analysis.*
- 12. Which part of the paper is the least effective? *Why?*
 - a. *You're missing the prediction part in your paper. There were two goals of this paper after finding a model. Present the odds ratio of your covariates AND provide predictions. I suggest those three cases that were left out of the analysis.*
 - b. *Using 'we' in the paper.*