

Kevin Pinedea

Peer Review - ENGL 21007

Reviewing: Traffic Lights - Jeffry Romeo

1.) Does the author introduce the object in a clear and understandable way?

I feel as if, with this description of what a traffic light is, is a little too vague. Take for example “A traffic light is a metal object filled with many wires and different electric systems that help regulate the traffic activity at an intersection”, This would be a little to just thrown out there however since this paper is more for the general public I see why he chose to word it this way. I would insert before this the problem and why it was invented, something along the lines of “late in the 18th century there were plethora of accidents or traffic jams with horse carriages etc (This is exaggerated I don't know the history), so in the midst of this problem arose the traffic light. A complex marvel of engineering that later became the solution. However the complexity of it: wires, Electrical components(you can dive into this deeper later), and the need of labor to conduct, was a hassle. (than start talking about history and how it was human controlled). Secondly, I would watch out for grammar mistakes such as starting a sentence with “and”. Overall however, this paper was clear to me who knew nothing about traffic lights, I understood it in a very precise and clear manner.

2.) Who does the intended audience seem to be? How can you tell?

I feel the intended audience would be the general public or someone who knew nothing about the topic at first. I could easily figure this out by the simplicity of the chosen wording, and the clear and concise structure of this intro.

3.) Does this letter offer a comprehensive history of the object, mechanism, or process described?

This paper gives a somewhat deep dive into the history of traffic lights and how they were controlled by an officer at one point which I did not know. The introduction of this mechanism was a litte too vague but seeming this is only an intro I understand the simple choice, could use a little more wording though. Overall I think it gives a deep insight into the history of the mechanism, not so much of how it would function on a surface level.

4.) offer three suggestions or how the writer should proceed in their description.

My three suggestions would be:

- a.) Try to watch out for common grammar mistakes and go into writing a paper with a known structure.
- b.) Try a new choice of wording for the paper to make it sound a little more professional, even the paper is based on someone who doesn't know much, try using this paper not only to teach them the mechanism but maybe new terminology.
- c.) One big paragraph was a little daunting to look at, maybe separate this paragraph into sections such as introduction: where you talk about the mechanism and how it works on a surface level (so is not to spoil the rest later on), history: where you deep dive into the history even if on a surface level as well, Restate: where you explain to the reader what your gonna be talking about introducing electrical components and how learning about this could be beneficial to them.