Rules of Peer Review

Peer Review is the process of subjecting your project reports to review by your classmates.   The rules are:

0. The author's name must **NOT** appear in any of the submitted documents.   Any leak of identification (name, student ID, nickname, *file properties*, etc) will be considered as a fraud, and as a consequence the author will be graded **zero**. Intentional disclosure of identity constitutes **cheating**.

1. Each report will be distributed to at least **3** other peers for evaluation.

2. Each author must evaluate at least **3** reports of peers before the given deadline.

3. For one who fails to complete the assigned reviews in time, **5** points will be taken off for each missing review from one's total gained points.

4. For each report, if the difference between the maximum and the minimum review scores is no greater than the threshold defined by the teacher (**25** points for this semester), its final grade will be the **average** of all the review grades. Otherwise the report will be sent to the teacher to arbitrate.

5. The teacher has the right to arbitrate any report that he/she believes is gaining abnormal scores.

6. Once enter the arbitration, the teacher's decision will be final.   In this case, suppose that the teacher gives *T* points and one has given *G* points as review scores, then if $\Delta = |T - G| > TOL$ where *TOL* is the tolerance threshold   (**25** points for this semester), one will be taken off **| Δ – *TOL* | points** from one's total gained points.

7. After the peer review, each participant may grade the graders – that is, to evaluate the performances of every grader of your own report.   The results of this evaluation will be shown to the graders as a kind of feedback, and will **NOT** affect their grades.   However, it will affect the grader's **opinion weight** for the next peer review.

Student Guidelines for Peer Review

0. Before you even make your first comment, **read the document** all the way through.

1. Point out the **strengths** as well as the weaknesses of the document.

2. Offer **suggestions**, not commands.

3. Be sure that your comments are clear and **text-specific** so that your peer will know what you are referring to (for example, terms such as "unclear" or "vague" are too general to be helpful).

4. As a reader, raise questions that cross your mind, points that may have not occurred to your peer author.

5. Be careful not to let your own opinions bias your review (for example, don't suggest that your peer completely rewrite the paper just because you don't agree with his/her point of view).

6. Reread your comments before passing them on to your peer. Make sure all your comments make sense and are easy to follow.