

# DP Peer Review Assignment

6.033 SPRING 2018

Due 5/11 at 5:00pm

Peer review is a standard component of academic and professional writing, lending credibility to published research and scholarship. Most of the professional writing we do, for publication and in industry, is reviewed by colleagues and other potential audience members. Conference papers are reviewed by peers. More informally, scholars, scientists and engineers review one another's writing, provide the perspective of a reader, and offer new ideas and new solutions.

In 6.033, you will read some portions of another team's final design report (DPR) and offer feedback and insight. Experiencing the same assignment as both a reader and a writer can deepen your understanding of your own work. It also gives you the opportunity to learn about another design. The goal of a peer review is to improve the original system and paper; to give insights about the system and the paper to the authors; and to support the authors' review process. Although you will exchange reviews after the paper deadline, your review should provide a positive contribution to the authors.

Unlike typical peer reviews, your 6.033 peer review is limited in scope. It should take 1-2 hours, and will not require you to read the entire report. Instead, you'll read the introduction and system overview, and a few other portions of the paper as necessary to answer the following questions. Once you have read those portions, summarize your observations and suggestions (~500 words) to the authors of the paper.

*You will be reviewing the DPR of the same team for which you did your in-class peer review. They will email you their DPR after they submit it, so you will have their copy for review shortly after the DPR deadline. If you have not received their DPR by the following morning, please email your TA immediately.*

*We recognize that you cannot complete this peer-review assignment until you have the other team's DPR. We're releasing it ahead of time so that you know what to expect. Moreover, understanding what we expect from a peer review should inform your own team's writing.*

## Questions

1. Based on the system overview and introduction, what are the design priorities of this system?
2. Summarize how data (e.g., a software update) is transferred from the FCS to a smart device (skim the paper to find this answer).
  - What decisions or design choices were made? Was this easy to find out?
  - Does the text identify any major tradeoffs?
  - Can you tell how those decisions and the overall data transfer design support design priorities (identified above)?
3. Considering the system overview and the sections of the paper you read to answer Question 2, are justifications clear and easy to find?
4. Does the evaluation approach and evidence link to the design principles? How?

## Structure of the peer review

**Introduction:** present the purpose of the paper, name the design principle you identified, and summarize key observations or suggestions.

**Body:** Respond to questions above; note problem and concerns but also successes; offer solutions to problems you identify; use specific evidence from the text to support your assessment.