

## 18.100C PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES

Peer review in 18.100C is a way for you to help your classmates improve their papers. To write a review that is helpful, try to provide the sorts of comments that you would find helpful for your own revisions.

As you prepare your review, consider the following questions:

1. Is the paper clear?

The assigned audience for WA2 is students in 18.100C; as such a student, the author should write clearly enough for the paper to make sense to you. Point out anything that you find to be confusing or unclear. Try to point out precisely what is causing the confusion so the author can determine how best to clarify the text.

2. Is the paper consistent and correct?

If you aren't comfortable stating that something is incorrect, you could word your comment as a question ("Why is...?") or as a confusion ("I don't understand why...").

3. Are topics presented in a logical order?

Does the overall structure of the paper make sense? Does each paragraph convey one main idea? Do the sentences in each paragraph proceed from previous statements?

4. Does the paper achieve an appropriate balance of concision and explanation?

Point out places where the text is too wordy or too concise.

5. Is the paper proofread for grammar, spelling, etc.?

Be sure to give some honest feedback about what is done well in the paper as well as suggestions for improving the paper.

Your peer reviews should be written *for the author* of the paper under review, not for me. That said, I will still read and grade the peer reviews, according to the following scale out of 10:

- 10 A thorough review that points out confusing parts of the paper and includes helpful suggestions (e.g. suggesting restructuring, how to explain more clearly, ...) and/or probing questions (e.g. Is this lemma really necessary? Could you prove this claim more elegantly by...?). Rationales for comments are clearly explained.
- 7 A less thorough review with some helpful comments.
- 4 Few helpful comments.
- 0 Failed to submit a peer review.

You will be assigned two papers to review. Your review should be written with L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X. Generally speaking, it's best to begin with general comments written in paragraph form then proceed to specific comments in the form of a list. (For this latter portion, you may find the `enumerate` package useful.) The total length of *each* review should be 1-2 pages, and the reviews should be submitted via Stellar by 11:59pm **Thursday, March 10**. You are also required to **bring a copy** of your reviews to recitation on Friday, March 11. Reviews will be accessible to all members of the Stellar site so that authors may view reviews of their work.

---

*Date:* March 4, 2011.