

Decadal behaviour of sand bars



Peer Assessment Decadal Behaviour of Sand Bars The structure of this particular paper was sound but the only told part of the story. The abstract stated what was going to be examined, but not necessarily how or why this examination was taking place. I rated the overall structure as 7 out of 10 because the abstract did not explain why it was important that the features were picked because they had been in existence during a certain era of time.

I rated the quality of the presented material as a 22/25. There was in evidence throughout the report an array of material that verified the amount of work necessary to present comprehensive information in a defined manner.

The scope of the material, and the structured argument I rated on a lower scale due to the lack of focus. The scope of the material I gave a 15/25 and the structured argument received a 8/15. The reason for such a low score was that the report seemed to be a conglomeration of research and facts but it was not cohesive at all. The message of the paper was unclear or non-existent. The report did not show how the information related back to the abstract, and the information seemed to be presented in such a way that the writer of the paper was listing facts concerning the different bars, but that was all that was listed. There seemed to be a total lack of explanations or arguments throughout the entire paper, although there was definitely sufficient evidence to support the arguments if any had been made. It was nice to find that there was that large amount of information available, but it would have served a better purpose if that information had been presented in a way that would lead the reader to a conclusion.

The paper itself was very informative, but was also difficult to read. I gave the paper 20/25 points for the information even though there was no flow to the paper. There was (as I stated before) a plethora of information to whet the reader's appetite. It was disheartening to not enjoy the full meal.

Peer Assessment

Sediment Transport Regimes

The structure of this paper received 9 out of 10 points, as it had all the necessary components but lacked a bit on the presentation. The abstract was rather clipped in its verbiage and there were a number of areas throughout the paper that had the same problem.

The quality of the information (and the paper) received 21/25 points due to the breadth and depth of the content. The message was fairly clear and the argument was consistent although not as clearly stated. The evidence was there to support the arguments, it was the arguments themselves that were lacking.

The scope of the paper received 20/25 points. It followed the abstract closely and presented the information in an ordered manner, but did not show any critical thinking at all. The conclusions were drawn appropriately, but again, without any arguments present it is difficult to understand how the conclusions relate back to the abstract. The focus of the paper was sharp but the critical thinking was fuzzy.

Page 3

As stated above, there was no structured argument present in the paper, or if there was one it was relatively obscure. Therefore, the paper received an 11/15 for the score on structured argument. It would have been lower but there was enough information provided that could have been formed into an

argument, that I was a little bit lenient. The writer did not include his/her own viewpoint, relying instead on what the 'experts' had to say in their studies. The paper was informative and provided the reader with enough information to draw some conclusions but did not present any conclusions on its own. I awarded the paper 20 out of 25 points because it was so informative. This is understandable due to the lack of a strong argument, but it would have been a much stronger, clearer message if presented in a more comprehensive style. The overall point total was 80 out of 100.