When reviewing a paper, you should make comments on the paper itself and also write a separate response to the big ideas of the paper. While you can and should point out specific typos and grammatical issues, these should not be the focus of your review (as in, they can be noted on the paper itself, but the written review does not need them). Your review should be at least 400 words and should include an answer to question 1 below and at least three more of the questions below. You should either email your written review to the author(s) and copy Rebekah or bring two printed copies to class on the due date of the review.

Note: when writing a review, you should make your comments sound as neutral as possible, e.g., "a more recent reference would better support the claim in paragraph 3 on page 5" as opposed to "you used an outdated reference to support your claim in paragraph 3 on page 5; if you want your reader to believe you, find a more recent reference." Your goal in writing the review is to help the author(s) improve their papers, so you want to make it as easy as possible for the author(s) to read the review objectively. And when you read your own reviews, take them in this spirit as well.

Questions

1. What do you think the **strengths** of this paper are? Consider content, language, style, etc. Make sure to be specific and comment on why you think the things you are listing are strengths.
2. Consider the **abstract**. Does it accurately represent the ideas in the paper? Does it give a good big picture view of the paper? Does it draw the reader in?
3. Consider the **accuracy and precision** of any included mathematics. Is the content and reasoning accurate? Is the language precise?
4. Consider the **audience and interest** of the paper. Is the explanation appropriate for a general (group project)/math-specific (individual project) audience? Does the narrative place the mathematics in context, explaining the history or importance of the mathematics included? Will the narrative attract the interest of a general/math-specific reader?
5. Consider the **clarity of explanation**. Are there areas that are difficult to understand? Do some ideas need more development? Why, and what ideas do you have for how the author(s) can develop them further? Where, if at all, might the paper be more focused or streamlined? Are there sections that should be cut altogether?
6. Consider the **introduction and conclusion**. Does the introduction capture the attention of the reader? In what ways? Does it introduce key ideas in an accessible way? Does the conclusion provide closure to the ideas of the paper? In what ways? Does it leave the reader motivated to learn more? Do the introduction and conclusion work together well?
7. Consider the **organization** of the paper. Outline what you believe to be the paper's key ideas in each paragraph. How well do the ideas work in sequence? Are there areas where changing the order of paragraphs or sentences would work better? Why? Where might stronger/smoother links between paragraphs be warranted, and what ideas can you offer to make those links?
8. Consider the **sources and citations**. Are the sources appropriate in what they are and how they are used in the paper? Is the amount of citation appropriate? Are there sources you might cut or another source or type of source that might be helpful? Is the bibliography appropriate? Is the style of the citations consistent for every source?
9. What **questions** does this paper raise for readers in general and for you in particular? Is there anything else you would like to **comment** on for this paper?