

## **Comments to the Peer-Review and Instructor Comments**

The peer and instructor feedback to our group's first draft with the first set of tasks was very beneficial to us. It gave us the opportunity to make changes to our first set of tasks and incorporate more accurate calculations and organization in completing the second set of tasks. Some of the feedback was more helpful and accurate than others; therefore, our first priority in making revisions was making changes based off the instructor's comments.

Some of the peer feedback we received stated, "Thickness is not properly calculated," and "Where is the flange going?" Further feedback stated, "Points deducted for not being specific or elaborating." Some of the instructor feedback stated, "What you call 'calculations' are not calculations. You need to compute thickness," and "Where are your calculations for the blind flange?" The instructor also suggested we should organize better and to list the losses per suction and discharge pipelines.

After reviewing all of this gathered feedback, we decided to redo the calculations for the wall thickness of the storage tanks and pipes, blind flange, and hydraulic analysis. We also specified the conversion factor in task 1, reorganized report headings, and more clearly documented our sources.

There is always room to improve. If more time was given before submitting our final report, we would further verify our calculations, organize better, and create clearer diagrams and explanations. Having feedback for the second set of tasks would motivate us to make any further changes.

### **Reflection on the Peer-Review**

Participating in the peer review process was beneficial to our group, group 11, in many ways. It gave us the opportunity to receive feedback regarding our project decisions, calculations, and report setup before turning in the project for a final grade. This way we were able to look at the feedback and decide whether we needed to make changes or explain our previous work in a clearer way. We received helpful feedback, for example, regarding missing calculations and organizing headings.

In addition to receiving feedback, it gave each of us the opportunity to analyze another group's draft and give feedback. Doing this gave us a fresh perspective on how things should be done. Even though every group may have made different decisions regarding the tasks, it still allowed us to find mistakes that we may not have caught on our own report regarding the rubric, etc. It also gave us the opportunity to try and help another group.

The downside to the peer reviews was that our peers are not experts and are still learning along the way, just like us. Peer feedback is not always completely accurate or fair. Some people may have spent more time and effort than others, and some feedback may have been more accurate than others. That's why having multiple peers review our report was beneficial. This way we would be able to review each of our peers' comments, find similarities between them that suggested we take another look at something, and decide for ourselves if changes needed to be made.

Even though receiving this feedback from peers was important, it was not as valuable as the instructor's comments. The "client" for the project is the instructor, and it is more important to meet the needs of the client rather than peers. Afterall, the instructor is the one grading the report. For these reasons, the most important thing for our group in editing our report was looking at our grade and feedback given by the instructor himself.