

## Math Peer Review Questions

**Audience:** Who seems to be the intended audience? What suggests that to you? What is this audience's interest in the proof? Why might they care? Do you have ideas about how the writer might shift language and structure (and ideas?) to more effectively address this audience?

**Introduction:** Does the writer offer an overview that outlines the problem? Does the writer explain what s/he will do, and why? Does the writer give some context for the problem and the proof? Do you have ideas about what the intro might do that it doesn't, or what the writer might do differently?

**Statement/Conjecture:** Restate the conjecture that you hear or that you almost hear. Are there ways you might suggest that the writer re-shape and re-state his/her conjecture? Why?

**Specificity/Conciseness:** Choose 1-2 sentences that seem "bulky" or less clear. As a group, re-work the sentences, paying particular attention to: use of pronouns (is the antecedent clear), double negatives, active verbs (watch for "ing" verbs and "would" verbs) and clear connections between the agent of the sentence and the action of the sentence.

**Transitions:** Are you able to follow the logic of the proof? What connections is the writer making between ideas? Would repetition of the previous concept/term help to clarify? How about a transitional phrase or term?

**Complete Proof:** Would you call this proof "complete"? Why/why not? What would you like to see developed?

**Holes:** Do you see any gaps in the writer's reasoning or ideas? Are there concepts or ideas or connections that you think could be clarified or strengthened?

**Images** to help the reader if applicable: How does the writer use graphics or images? What are these graphics or images being used to do? Is it clear how the graphics/images work with the text? Would you like more/less graphics/images? Why? Do you have ideas about how the writer might tighten the connection between the images/graphics and the written text?

**Process:** Did you get a sense of how the writer arrived at his/her proof? What process did s/he follow? Do you want a better sense of that process? Where and how might the writer incorporate that?

Was there anything that you found particularly interesting or intriguing? Do you have questions?