Peer Review of Lab:

Reviewer Name:_____

Title of paper:_____

Date you received paper:_____

Reviewer, discuss where you find major errors or items that might need correcting. Indicate where such items are located within the paper. Markup your copy of the paper as needed. If a question is not applicable then indicate NA. You may attach additional pages if needed and add additional categories. (or appropriately edit this document)

---

1. Does the paper adhere to an appropriate format.

   Title: _____
   Names: _____
   Date: _____
   Abstract: _____
   Procedure: _____
   Results: _____
   Conclusion: _____

   Other paper outline formatting:

2. For each of the sections listed above (or appropriate equivalents) are there any formatting changes or recommendations that you have? If so, briefly indicate. (If you have more extensive comments---so indicate, place such comments directly on the paper you are reviewing. You may list significant issues here:

3. Is the analysis of data generally correct (as far as you can tell)? There must not be errors. Discuss if needed.

4. Is the reporting of numerical results and use of scientific notation and uncertainty handled appropriately? Discuss if needed

5. Is the physics behind the experiment clearly explained and sufficiently complete? Did you need to examine any reference material to understand the reading of this report (if yes give reference and discuss briefly—(Can//Should the author do anything—additional explanation?) And are there any general improvements you might suggest? Is there information that should be omitted as either trivial or not supportive of the main purpose of the paper (not significant)?

6. In what manner did this author expand upon the minimum assigned tasks (analysis, discussion, or experimental).

7. On the paper directly you should note specific problems with figures, figure captions, grammar, spelling, equation positioning, etc.

8. Give an overall ranking for each of the following categories. The scale is 1 to 5 with 1 being the best. 1=strongly agree, 2 agree, 3, neutral, 4 disagree, 5 strongly disagree (or similar equivalent comments when appropriate).

The report adheres well to the AJP/APS format in all categories _____

There are no formatting revisions that will make this paper more readable _____

The numerical results with uncertainties are properly reported and handled in the abstract and throughout the paper (including appendix) _____

The analysis and discussion presented in the paper was complete and required no revisions or clarifying suggestions _____

The report demonstrated that the author went beyond the minimum required tasks assigned. _____

You may add another comment or two and give a rating:

Comment 1: _____

Comment 2: _____