Caitlin Post

ENGL 182

SA4: Workshop

**My Responses to Peer's Projects**

**Nachiket Nitin Karmarkar:** You have done a good job discussing the uncertainty of security on the internet. Your examples explained reasons and consequences appropriately. I particularly liked the Capitol one case study. Even though it was long, it clearly explained what companies go through after data breaches. I think that since the topic is so broad, you should also focus on how cyber security is being improved. What innovation is being done in the industry to tackle these security issues ?

**Yuxinyao Qiao:** I like the overall topic. Impulsive shopping is a real issue with the use of targeted ads everywhere. I think you should include statistical evidences to support your claim. You could include statistics about how spending has increased since e-commerce. I think you could also compare the example modes given based on the conversion rate, since they vary a lot on that factor. For eg. email ads are far less effective today than targeted ads (recommendation systems).

**Detlef Spenser Knauss:** The topic is very interesting, and clearly very relevant. The interview is also structured pretty well. You could include some counter-arguments to make it look more real. You should try getting a friend to record the questions so that the voices are distinct. Also, don't forget to re-record the first half of the audio, as it was really unclear.

**Lexi Jade Rodriguez-Padilla:** I like the overall topic since it is such a relevant claim. I think you divided the content amongst too many different topics. You could go in depth in any of them, you don't necessarily have to cover them all. Also, each paragraph starts with the mention of the article. I think it should be the other way round - you should build up the arguments first and then use the article as a support. Also, you should work more on the conclusion - break it up into more sentences to make it clear.

 **Juan Alejandro Hillon:** The overall claim seems very appropriate. I like how you discuss both consumer's. and musician's point of view with examples. Since you mention that overall revenue of music industry increased, that should mean that average revenue for each musician should have also increased. You should address that. Moreover, tech's benefits to music industry outweighs the disadvantages. Including a small section about how tech benefitted the music industry would look nice.

**Feedback for me**

When I appeared for this workshop, my paper's idea and content were in a very undeveloped stage. And honestly, I did not expect to obtain such a constructive feedback from my peers, something that helped me enormously with MP2. All the reviews provided me with cool ideas and structural suggestions which I really benefitted from.

Firstly, a bunch of feedbacks asked me to work on the explanation of my claim. These feedbacks entailed that I do not explain the importance of the claim well. Hence, I decided to add a "The value of big data" section in the beginning of my paper. Sarah Valmeo Yang suggested me to add more information on how parties interact with each other in the context of my paper. From her feedback, I figured that it is very important to explain the interaction between parties as that is the most important aspect of my model. Hence, I decided to break down the explanation of interaction into input of data into the network, and different kinds of access to the data. I also used graphics to showcase what a contract would look like for different kinds of parties.

Hannah Yoonkyu Lee suggested me to use existing models of data to explain my idea around my model. This suggestion helped me hugely as I categorized data into Transactions, Insights, and Raw Data to better explain my model. These terms were taken from an existing model introduced by Accenture, a reputable software giant. Using their model, I was able to explain some concepts, which otherwise could have been really difficult.

A lot of the feedbacks showed concern that a lot of the math used in the paper was hard to understand. That is something I expected, but I have tried my best to improve my explanation by using better graphics, as well as more elaboration. These feedbacks helped me with a lot of decisions I made while composing Major Project 2.

The feedbacks I received:

**Ryan Q. Kao** : Something I really enjoyed about this rough draft was how detail-oriented it was. You go on to great lengths to identify the problems inside our current methods of collecting data, but all of this information leads me to ask for the source of all this information. I know you mentioned inside your peer review session that this information was from thoughts that were already in your head, but I think the inclusion of sources to support your analysis will go very far towards proving your argument. In addition, I personally do not yet understand where you got the numeric percentage values from and am interested in seeing you provide more information on how you arrived to those values. Another piece of feedback I wanted to add would be to allow yourself to add in statistical data into your other arguments because those numbers would allow your audience to contextualize the scope of your argument.

**Lexi Jade Rodriguez-Padilla**: I like the overall topic since its such a relevant claim. I think you divided the content amongst too many different topics. You could go in depth in any of them, you don't necessarily have to cover them all. Also, each paragraph starts with the mention of the article. I think it should be the other way round - you should build up the arguments first and then use the article as a support. Also, you should work more on the conclusion - break it up into more sentences to make it clear.

**Marlene Probst:** I think that the direction of your MP2 seems very informative and interesting. I think that in this process it is important that you decide who you want your

audience to be since this will impact how technical you are able to make your language and presented information. Also adding citations to the evidence you have presented will make your paper seem much more credible. I think you have a very compelling claim and central argument at the moment though the presentation of your paper seems a lot more like a proposal than an investigation into a certain topic or research question. Perhaps you could mitigate this by making sure to address a counter argument, and by presenting your information and argument in a way that does not assume your audience already agrees with you.

**Grace E Grotz**: Overall, the central claim seems complex and interesting and the outline is well-organized. Are there more counter arguments you could mention in your claim? Also, addressing the target audience in the introduction could help readers understand if the argument is meant to persuade or educate. For the data section, some descriptive captions or analysis could help readers understand what the main takeaways are from the results.

**Sarah Valmeo Yang**: I think your topic is very interesting and you have a good structure for your project. The research you have done is great already, but citing some of your sources would help back up your points and emphasize your argument. I think you could add some more about why your proposed solution is a good solution as well. I also believe that more explanation of how the parties interact with each other would be helpful, as at times it was hard to follow. Similarly, explaining the math you have would make it easier to read and understand. Clarifying who your target audience is and seeing how you can cater to them would help enhance your project. Overall, it is a great start to your project!

**Yunjee Kang**: There is a lack of explanation of your argument. There is a solution but the reason why we need a solution is missing. Another way to look at it and possibly help is by finding a specific target audience. Then combining those factors together, it can help you and the audience understand what action should be taken after reading this. To support your idea, utilizing facts will hold your structure together and can help add opinions to the explanation. The main suggestion is to explain where everything is coming from, whether it be facts, opinions, or math, it is difficult to interpret some sections, especially for those who do not understand or have an idea of this concept.

**Lily Belle Von Feldt**: I thought your project was very interesting because you actually delve into the nitty gritty logistics of a possible solution. That being said, I don't think you spent enough time setting up the problem compared to the amount of time you spent detailing your solution. Furthermore, you never really explain why the system you explain is the best option. I feel like this is a missed opportunity because you describe each step of your system at length so I feel like you have many opportunities to explain why each facet of your system is an improvement of our current system with the addition of evidence and your own opinions. On that note, you cite very little sources throughout your project. While you seem very knowledgeable on this topic, I think the addition of evidence from reputable sources will add credibility and strength to your argument and proposed solution. Finally, I think clarifying your target audience will help dictate the tone of your project.

**Hannah Yoonkyu Lee**

The introduction does a nice job of giving the audience an overview of the argument, and sets the paper up for what is going to be discussed. However, it might be helpful for the audience if the specifics of the proposed plan (not super specific or in depth, just a quick mention) were given after the claim, so the audience knows what to look for. In addition, I think that the explanations throughout the paper are mostly very thorough and informative, but depending on who your target audience is, some things could be explained more elaborately (e.g. bitcoin and blockchain, hosts, etc.). Of course, if your target audience includes members of the tech industries, they are likely familiar with these terms already, and no explanation would be required. Lastly, it might be more compelling to include more concrete examples or data regarding user data and/or the proposed model (i.e. if there are any current models or systems that mimic your proposed model, it might help the audience fully understand your position). Otherwise, the organization of the paper was clear and the ideas presented were very interesting!

**Andy Simmerman**

I think the idea and claim that you're proposing is very interesting. However, I don't know where you got any of your data from. If you cited some sources, that would definitely help improve the strength of the argument you're making. Not only are there no sources listed, but the sources are not cited in the actual paper, so it seems you came up with all this data on your own. Additionally, I don't know what your target audience is, but it may help to explain some of the concepts that you throw into the intro (for example, I have no idea what blockchain is). The only feasible target audience I could see for this piece would be people actively working on this project alongside you. I don't know if anyone else will have a grasp of all the concepts you are talking about unless you include more examples in the piece. I have no idea how you calculated the ownership values or why they are that way. However,

this is a really cool idea, and it'd be awesome if you could find examples and sources to back up the information you already had.