

Turnitin ID:1455553939

**FOUN 1014:CRITICAL READING & WRITING FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES  
& SCIENCE&TECHNOLOGY**

**SELF AND PEER REVIEW**

Instructor:Ms.Sewell Ayton  
ID:620112010  
class:Stream1(Monday)  
time:10am-12pm

### Self Review

After reviewing my own team's paper, it was noted that the major strengths of the paper include having done a good job developing the body of the paper thesis. Additionally, There were clear links between topic and thesis statement and body paragraph. Also the evidence provided is appropriate for audience, purpose and thesis.

A weakness was noted in with regard to the word limit. The specified word limit of our paper is 1500 words we are currently at 1390 words. This suggests that we may need to expound some more our ideas further to reach the specified word limit. It also indicates that we have may fair job in explaining our ideas so far as we are not that far below the word limit.

To improve on that aspect of the paper we should do more to explain points in some greater details, for example in the second claim, it is mentioned that inflammatory cascade is an immune response to bacterial invasion however it was not explained how that relates to the symptoms of *ecoli* experienced.

Reviewer:Stefan Mtichell (team 3)

peer:Adrianna Hunt(team 4)

### PEER REVIEW OF TEAM 4 SRP

The topic of the paper being reviewed is **IN WHAT WAYS DO LIVESTOCK IMPACT CLIMATE CHANGE**. The main purpose of this review is to assist in evaluate this paper for validity and quality of this paper.Additionally this review is done in order to meet the requirements of FOUN1014. The aim in mind is to assist the writers of the paper, so that the paper may be revised and a higher quality paper is developed afterwards.

Upon reviewing the paper, the following weaknesses were noted in the following areas: (1) Organization and (2) Main Idea Development.Regarding the organizaton, the structure of some sentences were skewed due to grammatical errors and incomplete expressions which affected the ideas being expressed.For example, in the introduction, the sentence, **Climate change is the rising sea levels that increase the risk of flooding, to the fluctuating weather conditions that threaten food production**. Moreover, the transitioning of ideas in paragraphs in the claims was not entirly fluent.For the main idea devlopment, it was well done except for the last claim which seemed to focus more on effects of water pollution caused by livestock rearing itself rather explaining how the water pollution contributes to climate change.

To its credit of the paper, the following strengths were noted: (1) Style and Format and (2) Good Supporting Details. The paper was generally interesting to read and a lot was learnt during the time spent reviewing the paper. The paper was also concise and generally easy to read. Also the APA format was correctly followed and the subheadings correctly as well the language used was appropriate for its audience. In my view the paper had enough evidence to support the claims and it was relevant to the topic sentences in the claims. The analysis of the paper done by the writers was also decent.

My recommendations to improve this paper based on the weaknesses outlined are: Firstly, The writers should review how they structure their sentences and check for grammatical errors as these disrupt the proper expression of intended ideas. Secondly, transitional phrases or words should be utilized to connect the ideas in the paragraphs in the claims; without this the ideas seem unrelated. Lastly, the writers need to revisit the third claim and expound more how water pollution affects climate change as previously stated above.

FOUN1014: Critical Reading and Writing in Science and Technology and Medical Sciences

Rubric for Self- and Peer-Review – (5%)

A

5.0

4.0

3.75

Excellent Self-review paragraph clearly and analytically identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper. Peer-review includes a brief introduction which clearly states topic and the purpose of the review; identifies two strengths and two weaknesses using appropriate examples; makes two meaningful/insightful recommendations for improving the paper. Paragraphs are focused, unified and coherent; excellent language skills with virtually no errors.

B

3.7

3.5

3.0

Good Self-review paragraph clearly identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper. Peer-review includes a brief introduction which states topic and the purpose of the review; identifies two strengths and two weaknesses using appropriate examples; makes two recommendations for improving the paper but these may not be very insightful. Paragraphing is good though there may be minor issues with coherence and unity; good language use with only occasional lapses in grammar and mechanics.

C

2.95

2.75

2.5

Satisfactory

Self-review identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper but may lack clarity in some sections. Peer-review includes an introduction but the purpose and focus may be unclear; identifies two strengths and one

F

2.45

1.95

1.45

weakness or one strength and two weaknesses without using examples; recommendations for improving the paper are not insightful. Paragraphing is acceptable though there may be some issues with coherence and unity. Language errors are evident but are not pervasive.

Unacceptable Self-review or peer-review has been omitted. Reviewer merely summarizes aspects of the papers; does not present an analytical review. Does not include an introduction, identify strengths and/or weaknesses or make recommendations.

Recurrent grammatical errors and inappropriate language use.