

CS 4100, Spring 2011– Programming Languages
Peer Review Response
May 4 and 6, 2011

Author's Name _____ Reviewer's Name _____

Note: This review of the author's preliminary draft does not address issues of language utilization, punctuation, spelling, appropriate acknowledgement of sources, etc. which will contribute to the quality of the final paper. It is the author's responsibility to see that those issues are covered in the final draft.

- 1) Read the paper through once, and then write one paragraph immediate reaction. Did it capture your interest, for example? Or did it “feel” disjointed? Was it easy to understand? Remember to be honest.

- 2) Is the thesis of the paper clearly stated near the beginning? Quote the thesis statement from the paper. (If you have trouble isolating one, discuss this with the author and agree upon a suitable one before proceeding.)

- 3) Go over the paper again, and list the main ideas you find in the order that they are presented. Are there any parts of the paper where it is hard to discern the main idea? Do any of the sections of the paper seem unrelated to the thesis?

- 4) Which of these main ideas did you find to be the most well written or interesting? Why?

- 5) What parts are confusing to need more development? Can you say something about what might help? For instance, are there terms of underlying concepts you don't understand?

- 6) As a classmate of the author's, you represent perfectly the audience to whom the author is writing. In particular, the author should provide all of the background information and definitions you need so you can understand even the most technical details of the paper. Considering the issues on the front of this sheet, along with any other reactions you have, write a closing paragraph addressing any of the following issues that are relevant to this paper:
- a) Is any important information missing?
 - b) As a knowledgeable computer scientist, do you find that the paper addresses the most interesting issues within its stated topic?
 - c) Does it waste time on relatively trivial or unimportant sub issues? Does it effectively isolate the few most important ideas, or does it seem to indiscriminately catalog loosely relate points?
 - d) Does the author present all sides of the complex issues fairly? Does (s)he effectively integrate material from a variety of sources? Cite examples where (s)he does and does not.
 - e) What other issues should the author pay attention to with this paper?