

Peer review

Religion



Peer Review Peer Review The first strength of these answers is that they begin by providing a detailed and correct definition of the major terminologies used in the paper. I was so pleased when I saw the term perception mentioned and fully explained in the first paragraph of the paper. This shows that the student was well prepared to tackle the questions and was talking about what he knows. If it were not so, he would not have given such a precise and accurate definition. The other strength is that the answers provided are correct and relevant (Gorringer, 2009). Besides, they are explained in details and illustrated so as to help in providing the insight on what is being discussed. Lastly, after providing such accurate answers, the student goes ahead to provide reference materials indicating all the resources used in the paper. It is a good idea to give credit to such authorities because they are reputable and produce credible and reliable work that need to be included in such a paper (Hendricks, 2005). Despite this, I noted that the responses have weaknesses. First, even if attempts were made to define important terminologies, not all of them were touched. Others were deliberately left out. The other weakness is that the language used in the paper was not up to standard (Bruce, 2007). Upon a keen review, I found out that there are some redundancy and grammatical errors. Last, but not least, the answers did not include a background information on what was being discussed. Meaning, it was shallow and not in-depth as it ought to have been.

References

- Bruce M. (2007). *Know the Truth*. New York: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Gorringer, T. (2009) *Crime, Changing Society and the Churches Series*. London: SPCK.

Hendricks, V. (2005) *Thought 2 Talk: A Crash Course in Reflection and Expression*, New York: Automatic Press .