**To: Polina Beskrovnaya**

**From: Siarra Sens**

**Date: November 21st, 2016**

**Subject: Peer Review of Formal Report Draft**

It was a pleasure to read your report on implementing the Green Initiative

at UBC’s Haney lab. It was well organized, informative, and engaging. After carefully reading it though, I’ve put together some specific areas of the draft where revision could lead to marked improvements in the next stage of the report project:

**Content**

* Since you include an extensive amount of information in your report, I was impressed by your conclusion summary.
* In the subcategory: Stable long-term generation of LED light brings more financial benefits, I recommend including the price difference of these two light bulbs and the estimated savings in say, 10 years time or so. This statistic would be valuable information to support your point.
* I suggest summarizing the highlights of table 2 as it is a littler overwhelming at first glance.
* In your conclusions, I recommend including the percentages of energy, time, or money saved in a specified time. These added details provide the reader with a summary of the significance of your report and leaves an impact on the reader with the added benefit of displaying thorough research.
* Your report clearly identifies and analyses an area for improvement, though not significant improvement, as your report states. It has, however, recommended workable and affordable solutions
* As ‘mercury toxicity’ is important technical terms in the report, I suggest a brief definition and/or explanation when you first discuss it. Are the lab students exposed to severe mercury toxicity or minor, what are these symptoms and side effects. This may be interesting and influential data to add to your report to increase the significance of it.
* Overall, your report is logically laid out with problems and solutions discussed in an organize progression, well done! I do however see an added benefit in including more research quotes or evidence to back up your proposed solutions, or at least an evidence-based fact from two separate authors in each bullet point of your proposed solutions when you have used just one.
* Each section of your report is highly relevant to your identified reader and supported your proposal nicely. I was also impressed that you used interviews as well as questionnaires to support your own personal research.

**Organization**

* You clearly displayed effective heads and sub headings that lead into your content clearly and add to the general flow of your report, especially with the use of different sizes in font, different colours, bullet points and numbered bullet points; this is essential in your report as you cover a large amount of information! I do however think the green font would be better suited in a larger font size.

Your recommendations section states: Please consider the following suggestion that can help enhance *the quality of research at the Haney lab* and prove beneficial to all its members. Are your recommendations also related to the Green Initiative, if so, I would state this just to be clear and ensure this section ties in completely with your report.

* While your tables are clear and easy to read, I suggest incorporating a brief, concise summary of extracted highlights underneath where appropriate, just as you would under a figure. This was a good example of a highlighted summary: “As illustrated by the survey results, at least 75% of the Haney lab members support the switch towards utilization of glass pipettes instead of the plastic ones.”
* I am unsure what ‘overlooked factors’ you are referring to in your limitations section, and I suggest including an example or two to provide more clarity for your reader.

**Style**

* I can tell you carefully wrote your report in an objective tone, from start to finish of your report. I only suggest now that you read through your report and alter your tone to reflect more confident, factual research, like “This often results in release of hazardous…” as opposed to “This can result in release of hazardous…” and “high amounts of plastic waste due to frequent use of tools also shows to have a negative impact on the environment” instead of “high amounts of plastic waste due to frequent use of tools can also have a negative impact on the environment”.

**Design**

* The figures are simple, clear, correctly and effectively labeled, though figure 1. was not the most effective use of an image as it could have just as easily been displayed in a chart. Figures 2 and 3 are excellently and effectively integrated into the print content of the report.
* Is the report draft reader-friendly and visually appealing? Could any parts of the report’s design (spacing, font size, layout) use improvement?
* This is a minor detail, but your table of contents would appear more organized with a dotted line leading from each section to the page number.

**Grammar**

* I would reword this last sentence in your background section:

These strategies have also been adopted by the Haney Lab at UBC, whose members are devoted to actively participating in maintaining a green environment.

What ***is*** the level of awareness towards sustainable research practices at the Haney lab?

 What ***are the opinions*** of the lab members regarding the daily operations in the facilities?

The following is a run-on sentence and would be better suited broken up in at least 2, but even 3 separate sentences: To help answer these questions, this report includes interpretation of results of the survey conducted among the lab members, as well as analyzes the details of proposed options of installing LED lighting at the growth facilities, and glass pipette handling, through a review of secondary sources and an in-person interview with Melina Biron, a research manager at The UBC Greenhouse.

I question whether this paragraph needs to be reference:

High Pressure Sodium (HPS) and fluorescent lighting are two of the most common artificial lighting types utilized in horticulture, or practice of plant cultivation. However, LED technology, has also been gaining attention among plant growers throughout recent years due to its capacity for improving crop health, eco-friendly properties, and resulting financial benefits despite initial high price per unit.

* This is a minor detail, but your table of contents would appear more organized with a dotted line leading from each section to the page number.