

# Peer Review Form for Scientific Articles AE2223-I

Fill in this form by typing, not by handwriting. Adjust space to need. The criteria correspond to those mentioned more elaborately on the checklist scientific articles, to be found on Blackboard. Use that checklist for a more elaborate description of the criteria.

<b>Elements</b>
<b>1. Abstract</b> Readable as stand-alone text – Informative on research and results – Clear key words
<b>Comments:</b> Overall, the abstract is good. However, the results, conclusions, and recommendations are missing.
<b>2. Introduction</b> Background information on problem – Clear motivation for research – Research question stated clearly – Structure article discussed if necessary
<b>Comments:</b> Clearly states the problem at hand. The introduction gives the structure, which is only necessary when IMRAD is not used. Aside from the section "Data Description", it corresponds to the IMRAD structure. I am not sure if it is necessary to still describe the structure in that case. Furthermore, the research question/hypothesis is missing.
<b>3. Method</b> Well-argued – Sufficient definition of concepts – Connection to research question
<b>Comments:</b> The graphical representation of the methodology is very nice. The method overall is quite clear. However, the argumentation is lacking sometimes. For example: "An Atmospheric Absorption Correction (AAC) was performed even though this disturbance was suspected of having a limited impact on the overall signal", why was it limited and why was it still included?
<b>4. Results and discussion</b> Results presented clearly - Validity of results discussed and supported – Relation text/illustrations clear
<b>Comments:</b> The results are discussed well, but the presentation could be a bit clearer. Currently, the table is a bit cluttered and the ranking is not clear. By creating separate figures where the airplanes are put in order of the rankings for a certain parameter, it is easier to see at first glance how they performed. I do understand that doing it this way may take up too much space, but a clearer presentation may be more important.
<b>5. Conclusions</b> Link to research question – Follow from previous material – Recommendations further research
<b>Comments:</b> As there was no research question to be answered, it is unclear whether the conclusion is sufficient. Furthermore, the purpose of the paper was to develop a reliable tool (as stated in the introduction), yet the conclusion seems to imply that the purpose was to find the most annoying aircraft. It would be advisable to make sure the introduction and conclusion are consistent with each other. The conclusion did show suggestions for future development of the tool, which is a plus.
<b>Reference use</b>
<b>6. Use of sources</b> Correct references – Good use of literal quotes – Good use of paraphrasing
<b>Comments:</b> The use of the references seems to be fine. The citation is in the right spot. Figure 2 does seem to miss a reference (This could be [10], however this is not clear, perhaps the citation can be placed in the figure description).
<b>7. Bibliography</b> References meet requirements – Correspondence references in text and bibliography
<b>Comments:</b> All references in the bibliography appear in the text and vice versa. The bibliography also seems fine.
<b>Content</b>

<b>8. Data analysis / research sufficiency</b> Your opinion on the data analysis and research sufficiency
<b>Comments:</b> The tool developed to analyze aircraft annoyance produces nice and clear results. However, it is unclear whether these results are actually valid. I believe your goal was to develop a new tool for analyzing aircraft annoyance, but I do not believe that the results really verify your tool. If you can argue why the results imply that your tool is working correctly, it would all come together nicely.
<b>9. Argumentation</b> Your opinion on the academic value of the argumentation – Critical review of literature
<b>Comments:</b> There was a clear gap in knowledge to be filled (a new tool to analyze aircraft annoyance), however it is unclear whether this gap has been filled. As I mentioned before, it is unclear what your goal actually is. What is the use of knowing that aircraft 2 is the most annoying in relation to the validity of the tool? What does it prove? The argumentation of why some abnormalities in the results are not mistakes is good, and the overall method for developing the tool is well-argued. All I am really missing is, as mentioned multiple times, the connection between your goal and your conclusion. Once this is in place, the article is fine.
<b>Structure</b>
<b>10. Paragraphs</b> Well-constructed – One topic – Clear topic sentences – Clear paragraph structure
<b>Comments:</b> Overall, the topic sentences are clear. There is a little bit of an inconsistency in the use of titles. All of section B of Methodology has titles for the different paragraphs, whereas section A does not. The division of the topics is clear in both sections, but it may be nice to either use titles for all paragraphs, or for none (Or make use of the bold text like in A). Lastly, sometimes a white line is used when introducing a new topic, and sometimes this is not the case. Mostly the white line is used for a new topic, but in the conclusion a simple indent is used. Try to be consistent in your structuring. I do believe that mostly each paragraph discusses one topic, so it is definitely a good start.
<b>Style</b>
<b>11. Style and language use</b> Correctness – Objectiveness – Clarity – Attractiveness
<b>Comments:</b> Last paragraph of Results contains a contraction ("isn't", instead of "is not"). I believe contractions are not allowed in a formal text. Additionally, in section B – Loudness, the unit is called phone and then phon. Other than these minor mistakes I would say the overall use of language is clear, and the writing is easy to read.
<b>Illustrations and layout</b>
<b>12. Tables and figures</b> Functionality - Number and caption – Reference in text – Reference to source – Legend/explanation
<b>Comments:</b> As previously mentioned, figure 2 misses a reference to the source. The way the paper references to figures is a bit inconsistent (Fig. 1 and Figure (2) and others). Figure 2 also seems to be cut off, as the caption is not complete. There is also no title, similar to the graphs in the appendix. There is no in text reference to table 1. The figures are quite clear and understandable. Just make sure you have in text references to them, and use a consistent style of referencing.
<b>13. Format</b> Font – Headings – Page lay-out – Adherence to template
<b>Comments:</b> I do not have any comments about the layout, I think it looks fine. The titles for the sections are clear and say something about the contents of the section.