# Title of paper:<your title>

Author(s) of paper:<your name(s)>

(blue text will be replaced throughout)

## My favorite thing in the paper

I'll tell you what I like best.

## Numerical ratings

I'll rate each of the following aspects of the paper on a scale of 1 to 5. Note that the order has changed from the peer review, as **these scores are organized by weight!** The most important aspects are listed first.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| There is a coherent main topic for the paper |  |  |  |  |  |
| The paper is directed to the correct audience (Math 4441 students) |  |  |  |  |  |
| The paper presents at least one substantial proof or computation |  |  |  |  |  |
| The paper is free of serious mathematical errors |  |  |  |  |  |
| New ideas are well-motivated |  |  |  |  |  |
| The presentation is in a logical order |  |  |  |  |  |
| The mathematical notation is consistent |  |  |  |  |  |
| The abstract gives a good summary of the paper |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adequate references are provided |  |  |  |  |  |
| The paper was carefully proofread |  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary evaluation of the paper

I'll write a short paragraph explaining my overall impression of the paper, and justifying some of the numerical ratings given above. I'll give your overall grade. Rough descriptions of the scores are as follows (out of 60 possible points):

- 50-60: This is a high-quality paper which achieves a 5 in all or most of the numerical ratings. Deductions are of a lower-order importance (e.g., typos).

- 40-50: A good paper which rates as a 5 in the top few categories, but whose communication might be somewhat jumbled, or otherwise not of a top-notch quality.

- 30-40: An acceptable paper, but one that is deficient in a top category (perhaps weak motivation or no substantial proof) or multiple lower-order categories.

- 0-30: A paper which falls short in several categories. Perhaps more of a working draft than a final submission.