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Worksheet 10: Tick IDs + Paper/Discussion + Scientific Review Process

Part 1: Tick Identification (2.5pts)

Identify the 5 5icks we found last week to species and sex below.

What are some potential host species they might have been searching for?

 Create an [iNaturalist](https://www.inaturalist.org) account and ID at least 15 tick observations from the SouthEast for each observation, write in the comments the identifying features you used to ID that specimen. Paste your “identifications” link here:

Grant’s example: <https://www.inaturalist.org/identifications/grant226>

Part 2: Participate in Paper Discussion in Class (2.5 pts)

Part 3: Scientific Review (5pts):

Scientific review is an essential part of the scientific process. In order to practice this, I’d like you to write a review of the paper draft located in blackboard titled: “The effect of host community functional traits on plant disease risk varies along an elevational gradient” by Halliday et al. The posted version is not the final version published, but a typeset version of the first draft submitted to the publication. Your review should be thorough and address all parts of the main text, but does not need to address any of the supplemental materials (though a normal review would!). Your review should begin with a paragraph generally sumamrizing the research and your overall impressions of its validity and relevance to the field, followed by itemized major and minor points. For help on structuring your review, reach out to Grant, or take a look at the following resources:
[ttps://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-peer-review/](https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-peer-review/)

<https://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/Publ_Peer-Review-Booklet.pdf>

Do the following question ONLY AFTER COMPLETING YOUR OWN REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT:

This article was eventually published in eLife, a journal which has a completely open review process. Take a look at the real reviews submitted by the real reviewers here: <https://elifesciences.org/articles/67340/peer-reviews#content>

What’s at least one thing that you listed in your review of the manuscript not talked about by the reviewers here?

What’s one thing one of the reviewers touched on that you did not for your review? Does this point change the way you think about the paper at all?