Homework Assignment #2, Evaluating Titles

N.B. This assignment will be peer-reviewed using the Peerceptiv® software tool.*

This assignment consists of three parts that must be submitted, as enumerated below. Make sure you complete all parts.

To prepare for the assignment, go to http://arxiv.org and read the "General Information" page (find the link near the bottom of the screen in the "About arXiv" section). Poke around a bit on the website and get familiar with it if you've not used it before. Because of the delay in getting papers published in the peer-reviewed literature, physicists will often post a "preprint" on arXiv to get results out to the community sooner.

N.B. ***Caveat lector!*** The papers posted to arXiv have not been peer-reviewed, and anybody can post anything to arXiv.

As an experiment, type <substantial text overlap attribution> (without the brackets) in the "Search or Article-id" box in the upper right corner of the screen and see what happens. (Hint: look for the "comments" line immediately below the authors' names in the results.) Make a mental note of this feature of arXiv for our discussion on February 20 of proper referencing.

Next, select a topic that you're interested in from the "Physics" section on the main page and click on the "recent" link. Scan down the list of titles that appear on the next screen.

1. Select one paper that you think has a particularly good title, and one that you think has a particularly bad title. In making your selections, glance over the papers and read at least the abstracts to see how well (or poorly) the title reflects the contents of the paper. Write down the full bibliographic citation for each paper (author names, title, arXiv ID number, date submitted).

2. Write a 300-word evaluation of ***each*** title (600 words total for the assignment). Justify why you assigned the "good title" and "bad title" designations to your two choices.

3. Suggest a revised title for the paper whose title you found inadequate and explain why you think it is better.

Due: **Friday, February 13, midnight**. Email copies to both Professor Gammie and Celia, ***and upload your document to your Peerceptiv® account***. Assignments submitted after the deadline will be downgraded and will be ineligible for rewrite points.

By 2/17/2015, midnight, complete your three peer reviews on Peerceptiv®.
By 2/20/2015 midnight, complete the back evaluations on Peerceptiv®.

*Your completion of the reviews and responses to your reviewers will contribute to your "participation" grade in the course, but will not be reflected in your grade for this assignment.

Total—50 points