

Aaron is a third year mathematics graduate student, and Professor Brown is one of the members of his thesis committee (not his advisor, but one who will scrutinize his thesis and decide the fate of his dissertation). Professor Brown is an associate editor of a well-known journal in his field and his job is to find anonymous reviewers for articles submitted to the journal. Reviewers are asked to carefully review the article and comment on the originality, scholarly merit, mathematical correctness/completeness, etc. Prof. Brown asks Aaron to review an article that was written by a colleague and old friend of his. In passing off the assignment, Prof. Brown hints that he'd really like to see a positive review of this one. Aaron reads the paper and finds that the article is not as good as it claims to be (overly restrictive assumptions, incomplete review of related works, generally sloppy writing, etc., etc.). How should he write his review of the paper? He is anonymous to the author but not Prof. Brown.

1. Write a vague and wishy-washy review of the paper. After all it's the editor's decision whether or not to publish it.
2. Write an objective negative review of the paper, clearly pointing out the deficiencies.
3. Write a short positive review and thank Professor Brown for the opportunity to be involved in the process.
4. Tell Prof. Brown that you're too busy to review this one, and suggest another student (who does not have him on their committee).
5. Other?