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Answer the questions below and make marginal comments on the paper itself as appropriate. Focus on comments that will help the writer to improve the paper in revision. Whenever possible, provide suggestions on how to fix any problems you notice. Attach the commented draft at the end of this form.

## Thesis:

Label the thesis statement in the first paragraph. Does it capture the paper’s main point? Is there a really good sentence elsewhere in the paper that would make a better thesis? If it’s not stated already, what do you see as the paper’s main point?

Is the thesis appropriately focused? If not, how would you alter its scope?

Does the thesis feel sufficiently objective? If not, how should the writer rethink their tone or approach? What alternative viewpoints should they consider?

After reading the paper, do you find the thesis convincing? What might make it more so?

Do you find the thesis debatable and interesting? What are the stakes of the thesis? How might it engage more explicitly or productively with interesting issues or debates?

## For EACH Body Paragraph (number them and list here, or answer in margins):

Is the first sentence an analytical claim? If not, is the paragraph’s main claim hidden elsewhere, or not clearly stated anywhere? Does the paragraph have more than one key claim (i.e. should it be split up)?

Is the claim sufficiently convincing and debatable/interesting?

Does the paragraph offer textual evidence to support its claim? Are quotations relevant and of an appropriate length? Do quotations contain interpretive complexities that invite/require analysis?

Is each quotation followed by sufficient and productive textual analysis, showing how the language of the passage works and why it is interesting?

## Argumentative Structure:

Read the thesis, followed by each topic sentence. What kind of shape does the argument have? Does it feel like a coherent outline?

Does each paragraph move forward through a chain of logic? Or does the structure reflect chronological movement through the text’s plot, or repetition of the same point with different examples?

How might the sequence of topic sentence claims be reorganized or improved?

## Conclusion:

Does the conclusion add something to the paper? Does it address the larger implications of the thesis?

## Style:

What points in the essay are clearly written? Indicate any confusing points and suggest clarifications.

What could be cut from this paper? Look for digressions, summary of the text, and wordiness.

How well did the writer proofread? Are there issues with grammar, spelling, or punctuation? Style or word choice? Formatting of paragraphs, quotations, citations? Any other technical issues? Briefly describe them here and mark examples on the paper itself.

## Final Comments:

List the three most important things the writer can do to improve this paper:

1.

2.

3.

What are the most interesting implications of the paper’s argument? If the writer were to take this argument one step further, where might it go?