

Peer Review Worksheet

Analyze your partner's analysis of their two lab reports. How thoroughly did they address each category of information? Were you persuaded by their conclusions and analysis? Was their analysis clear and understandable? Responses should be 100-200 words long. Email your completed sheet to your partner and CC me: jlobell@ccny.cuny.edu

Title: I think Saad a great job in breaking down the two titles from the reports that he chose. For the first one he explains why it's a good title and mentions how the title adds in key information like "Novel Python Libraries" to give better in site on what programing language it will be about. He continues the great work onto the second lab report by breaking it down into its two parts, saying what it did good, and how it followed the guide in the book.

Abstract: Saad also did a great part in breaking down the abstract. He starts by giving a short definition, then going into depth on the first abstract. He describes what it did good in, giving little notes in after each description, then ends it by saying that it follows our guide from the textbook. He does the same when breaking down the second lab report.

Introduction: The introduction follows the rest of the work so far, Saad gives a quick summary on what the introduction should be and then goes into depth on one report at a time. He does great on the first one talking what the lab report will be focusing on and highlighting what the author did good on. Also highlighting how the author of the lab report started to deviate from the original introduction and started to include other information that wasn't previously stated or hinted to, showing that Saad is paying close attention to the lab reports and considering what each section should have. He also does this for the second lab report mentioning how persuasive the introduction is, which is something that an introduction should have.

Methods and Materials: In this section Saad still does a great job, he gives a quick break down on what step he will be focusing on and gets straight to it. He lists lab report #1 materials then he goes straight into the method, describing how it's clear and adding in quotes to show specific parts of the method that are important to the over all lab. He does the same for the second lab, now introducing it by setting a contrast from the previous lab he clearly states what the materials are, then states the steps, even focusing on a deviation that are in the steps that he found interesting, and trying to explain why the author might've wanted to go off track a bit.