

1. Completeness = x/5
2. Background = x/15
3. Method = x/15
4. Budget = x/10
5. Grammar/Mechanics = x/20
6. Total
7. Constructive Criticism

<b>Reviewer</b>	Emory	Silverio	Caleb	Cheryl	Grace	Brian	Shimon	George	Ernesto
<b>Shimon Dukhovny</b>	1)5/5 2)14/15 3)14/15 4)9/10 5)17/20 6)59/65 7)Overall format (spacing, paragraphs, etc), only three citations, could use some more technical terms. Awesome TELA!	1)4/5 2)14/15 3)10/15 4)6/10 5)12/20 6)46/65 7)Grammar, metalanguage, explaining basic terms to specialists in the Aol. Interesting idea of application overall.	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)17/20 6)62/65 7)Citations used in abstract, and therefore are ordered incorrectly in the rest of the paper. Replace questions with statements.	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)8/10 5)18/20 6)61/65 7)A few long sentences, and each section is only one paragraph (harder to read). Good grammar.	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)14/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)62/65 7)No need to cite in the abstract, very minor grammar.	1)4/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)19/20 6)63/65 7)Overall format (spacing, paragraphs, etc). Also, no TELA? Interesting idea of application. Go for it!	That's me!	1)4/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)19/20 6)63/65 7)Missing citations. Interesting method, and good TELA!	1)5/5 2)12/15 3)12/15 4)10/10 5)14/20 6)53/65 7)Grammar, Lay proposal is too technical, citations needed.
<b>George Lee</b>	1)4/5 2)15/15	1)5/5 2)13/15	1)5/5 2)15/15	1)5/5 2)13/15	1)5/5 2)15/15	1)4/5 2)13/15	1)5/5 2)15/15		1)5/5 2)12/15

	3)14/15 4)9/10 5)18/20 6)60/65 7)topic provides great hook. concision	3)9/15 4)8/10 5)16/20 6)51/65 7)more detail in methods section	3)15/15 4)9/10 5)18/20 6)62/65 7)citation issues	3)13/15 4)9/10 5)20/20 6)60/65 7)good topic for large appeal.	3)15/15 4)10/10 5)19/20 6)64/65 7)abstract doesnt need citations. fantastic paper	3)13/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)58/65 7)TELA missing, fluidity	3)15/15 4)10/10 5)20/20 6)65/65 7)great paper		3)14/15 4)10/10 5)14/20 6)55/65 7)lay audience might have trouble with TELA
<b>Brian Nemec</b>	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)8/10 5)15/20 6)58/65 7)A lot of passive voice	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)5/15 4)10/10 5)20/20 6)59/65 7)Method doesn't go into details	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)13/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)62/65 7)The method isn't detailed Citations in abstract	1)5/5 2)10/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)20/20 6)60/65 7)Backgro und seems short	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)63/65 7)Citation s in abstract, very good method		1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)20/20 6)65/65 7)The equations used in the Appendix might not be needed	1)3/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)3/10 5)20/20 6)56/65 7)Missing Reference page, labor isn't free	1)5/5 2)15/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)63/65 7)The language doesn't target the right audience
<b>Grace Lunardi</b>	1)5/5 2)14/15 3)13/15 4)10/10 5)17/20 6)59/65 7)Some concision.	1)5/5 2)12/15 3)13/15 4)7/10 5)17/20 6)54/65 7)Concisio n and more detail on budget	1)5/5 2)14/15 3)13/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)60/65 7)Concisio n and minor naming convention	1)5/5 2)13/15 3)14/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)60/65 7) Concision		1)5/5 2)14/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)62/65 7)More citations	1) 5/5 2)14/15 3)15/15 4)10/10 5)18/20 6)62/65 7) Concision.	1)5/5 2)13/15 3)14/15 4)7/10 5)18/20 6)57/65 7) Go more in depth for TELA and budget	1)5/5 2)11/15 3)13/15 4)10/10 5)17/20 6)56/65 7) More citations and concision. Too tech

<b><u>Averages:</u></b>	54	53	61	60	63	61	64	58	56
-------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Highest average score: name , score

1. Shimon → 64
2. Grace → 63
3. Caleb and Brian → 61