

Peer Feedback

Due: Friday, 14 March 2025 before 17:00 EST

Objective: Provide 2 peers with constructive suggestions to help improve their projects.

Suggestions:

- Feedback should be assembled in a separate document which is easily duplicated. One copy will be submitted for grading and another copy goes to your peer.
- Subdivide your feedback into two sections: global comments and local comments.
- The global comments should include a paragraph describing what you understood to be the main result in the paper.
- The global comments should emphasize the overall document. Although tailored to the particular paper, they might highlight motivation, organizational/structural features, general comprehension, completeness, larger mathematical conventions, notational consistency, writing fluency, awareness of the audience, etc.
- Local comments are likely summarized in an itemized list. These suggestions and observations relate to individual sentences or explicit equations. For example, any improvements in word choice, spelling, grammar, or corrections of other typos would be listed in this section.
- Feedback should cover both the mathematics and the general writing.
- Be specific!
- Focus on how to improve the document.
- Don't forget to indicate the positive attributes.

Questions to consider:

- Does the paper motivate its central result?
- Are the mathematical arguments sufficiently explicit and detailed? Could you understand all of them?
- Are there enough examples to illustrate the key ideas?
- Is the mathematical notation simple, clear, and consistent?
- Where do you see mathematical creativity?
- Are there appropriate references?
- Is the presentation compelling?
- Does the writer demonstrate a good grasp of the standard writing conventions?
- Do the words convey the intended message in a precise and natural way?
- Does the writing have an easy flow?

Checklist for Feedback on Rough Drafts

Name: _____

Drafts Reviewed: (1) _____

(2) _____

Trait	Score	Weight	Grade
<i>Effort:</i> Comments indicate that the reviewer carefully read the documents provided.	1 2 3 4 5	2×	
<i>Weaknesses:</i> Constructive suggestions are provided for the weakness of the paper.	1 2 3 4 5	1×	
<i>Strengths:</i> The strengths of the paper are identified.	1 2 3 4 5	1×	

Total:

Comments:

Explanation of Scores

5	Strong	Shows control and skill in this trait; many strengths present.
4	Competent	Strengths outweigh the weaknesses; a small amount of revision is needed.
3	Developing	Strengths and need for revision are about equal.
2	Emerging	Need for revision outweighs strengths.
1	Not Yet	A bare beginning.