Math 583C

Research in Geometric Analysis Paper Evaluation

Spring 2005

When you evaluate someone else's paper, in addition to making marks on the paper itself as needed, please briefly fill out this form and return it with the marked-paper to its author. If you read a paper containing sections written by different people, please fill out one evaluation form for *each* author.

thor's name:	
aluator's name:	
tle of paper:	

1. Summary

Summarize in one or two sentences the main point of the paper:

2. Organization

How well is the paper organized? How well does it fit together with sections written by other authors?

3. Motivation

How well does the author motivate the main ideas? (Consider explanations of background material, historical precedents, examples, applications, analogies, intuitive explanations, plausibility arguments.)

4. Accuracy

How accurately does the author present the material? Were terms clearly defined, necessary prerequisites clearly described, results clearly and correctly stated, proofs logically correct?

5. Terminology and symbols

Are the technical terms and symbols well chosen and clearly defined? Are there too many or too few?

6. Citations

Are references appropriately cited when needed? Are citations clear, accurate, and in the proper format?

7. Amount covered

Does the paper cover an appropriate amount of material? Too much? Too little? Is the amount of detail appropriate? Is the paper sufficiently focused?

8. Mechanics

How well does the author handle the mechanics of writing, such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, symbols and formulas, typographic accuracy, illustrations?

9. Author's understanding

How well does the author seem to understand the material?

10. Your understanding

How well do you feel you understand the material after reading the paper? Did you learn something new, valuable, interesting? Did the author assume too much background, or too little?

11. Overall impression

Please describe in a few words the general impression the paper left you with.

12. Further directions

Did the paper raise any interesting questions in your mind? What would you like to learn more about?

13. Suggestions

Do you have any other suggestions for improving the paper that were not already mentioned above?

Rating

Please give the paper an overall rating from 0.0 to 4.0:

0.0 = Unacceptable

1.0 = Poor

2.0 = OK

3.0 = Good

4.0 = Outstanding