

Writer:

Reviewer:

Paper Title:

Reviewer E-Mail:

Carefully read through your peer's entire paper once. After doing so, take the following steps:

Thesis

1. Locate the thesis of the paper and label it **THESIS**.
2. Does the thesis move beyond *identification* of an issue and say what the text *argues* about that issue? What could the writer improve in this regard?
3. What terms does the writer use in the thesis that could be made more specific? What terms need further explanation in the introduction?

Close Reading and Analysis

1. Does each paragraph (except the introduction and conclusion) include a quotation? On the draft, mark any paragraphs that need evidence by writing "Evidence?" in the margin.
2. Does the writer clearly and explicitly link the analysis of the evidence to her or his thesis? On the draft, mark any places where the evidence is not directly linked to a claim by writing "Link to claim?" in the margin.
3. Identify the most successful place that the writer analyzes a quotation. Describe why it is successful as compared to other parts of the draft.

4. Identify a place where the paper does not succeed as well in its analysis. Make some suggestions about how to improve the analysis in that paragraph/section. (Some possibilities: offer alternate interpretations; discuss complicating evidence; address the paragraph's linguistic, descriptive, or locational elements; explore the story's exploitation of specific literary terms and expectations)

Global Concerns

1. Comment on which parts of the argument you find most compelling. What would you absolutely keep (and beef up or improve) and what would you consider trimming? Why?