

Phil 101 PEER REVIEW FORM (revised F21)

Paper Writer: _____ Reviewer: _____

Writer: KEEP THIS FORM and use the comments to revise your paper.

Reviewer:

- Use the questions on this form to comment on the writer's paper.
- Put your comments on this form, or on the paper itself, or both. Use these questions; don't bother correcting spelling, grammar, word choice, etc.
- When you finish, give the paper and this form back to the writer.

Writer: Use the comments you receive to help revise your paper. It is up to you to decide whether to take your reviewer's advice. If you have any questions about the reviewer's comments, ask the reviewer and/or Jeremy.

1. Introduction:

- a. Is it half a page or less? If it is longer, circle or highlight everything that is NOT thesis or road map.
(Writer: find a way to shorten the intro.)
- b. Does the writer clearly state what main point they will make in the paper (their thesis)? Underline it. How could the thesis be improved? (For example, is it vague? Hard to understand? Can you tell *why* they will conclude that point?)
- c. Does the introduction include a definite step-by-step summary (road map) of how the writer will support the thesis? How could the map be improved? (For example, is it generic? Vague? Hard to follow? Incomplete?)
- d. (After reading the paper:) Does the rest of the paper do what the intro says it will do—does it support the thesis in the way the road map says it will? Is the road map complete?

2. Writer's presentation of the argument from the text:

- a. Is it *at least* one page long? Does it cite *all* sources used, properly? Mark where any citations seem to be missing.
- b. Is it clear—does it all make sense? Are there any parts you have trouble understanding? Mark them, "Huh?" or "I don't understand" and briefly say why.
- c. Does it demonstrate at least as good an understanding of the argument as you have? Make a note of anything you think may be inaccurate, or anything you think is missing.
- d. Does it explain the argument in the paper writer's own words, or is the wording all just borrowed from the text or class notes? Are there any quotes the writer doesn't explain?
- e. Reviewer: find at least two things to improve in this part of the paper.

3. Writer's evaluation of the argument:

- a. Does it cite all sources properly, including class discussion or notes? Mark where any citations seem to be missing.
- b. Is it clear—does it all make sense? Are there any parts you have trouble understanding? Mark them, "Huh?" or "I don't understand" and briefly explain why.

- c. By the end, are you really persuaded of the paper writer's thesis? DON'T BE NICE: try to think of why a smart person might disagree with the writer. What other objection should the writer consider? What problems can you see in the writer's reasoning?
- d. Reviewer: find at least two things to improve in this part of the paper.
- e. (Don't forget item #1d above: does the paper do what the introduction says it will?)