Peer Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Person whose paper is being reviewed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Look over the introduction and see if you have any feedback for the person. Pay attention especially to the hook. Is the hook a statistic, quote, or something else that requires documentation? Is it internally cited? If there is a Works Cited page already, does the internal citation match the first word(s) of the Works Cited entry? Mark on the paper. Note any problems below:
2. Look at the thesis—is it clear? Does it have a main claim and three subpoints? Mark any problems on the paper and note any problems below as well:
3. Look at the topic sentence of the first body paragraph – does it clearly connect back up to the first thesis subpoint?
4. Read the entire first body paragraph—you will read it twice. The first time, just try to take in ideas. Are the ideas clear? Are they logical? Do all the ideas in the paragraph support the topic sentence, or do they go off topic?

Does the paragraph have at least one outside source being used as evidence?

You should be able to clearly see where the writer’s ideas end and where the outside source’s information begins because the writer should be using an attributive tag. Find it and circle it. You should know where the outside source’s information ends because the writer should provide a parenthetical citation with a page or paragraph number. Find it and circle it, too. Note any problems/missing elements on the paper and on this sheet:

Does the writer spend time explaining the importance of the evidence being used? Write answer below:

Take a look at how much of the paragraph is taken up with the writer’s ideas versus how much of the paragraph is taken up with quoting or paraphrasing outside sources. As a general rule for this paper, we are aiming for equal space given to writer and outside source OR more space given to the writer’s ideas/explanations. Is the paragraph well balanced between writer and outside source(s), or does it feel unbalanced? Make a note on the paper and a note here. Put a star beside any direct quote that is a total of four or more lines long. If this is the case, then the quote needs to be shortened.

1. Read the first body paragraph again and mark any grammar mistakes that you see. Mark any mistakes with MLA format that you see as well. Please ask someone if you’re struggling with format.
2. Read the next body paragraph. Repeat all the steps under #4 and note below anything that you marked on the writer’s paper as needing to be strengthened:
3. Reread the next body paragraph and mark any grammar mistakes that you see.
4. If the next paragraph is another subpoint paragraph, repeat step under #4 and #5 and, on both the paper and below, note anything that needs to be strengthened.
5. If there is a rebuttal paragraph: Read the rebuttal paragraph. This paragraph should include clear discussion of the opposing view—the time given to the opposing view should not feel dismissive (just one sentence, for example). When you’re done reading this paragraph, you should feel like you have a good idea of what exactly those with the opposing view would argue about the topic and why. The paragraph should also include an outside source that highlights the opposing view’s argument and any explanation of why that outside source is important to the opposing view. Note below if any of these elements are missing, and also note on the paper:
6. The structure of a rebuttal and response paragraph will generally be the following:
7. Topic sentence outlining opposing view
8. Outside source highlighting the opposing view detailed in the topic sentence
9. Any necessary clarification of the evidence concerning the opposing view
10. Transition into writer’s response to the opposing view—the writer will begin to discredit the evidence, undermine the assumptions behind the view, dismiss the view as less important than the writer’s evidence, or something else… (EX—Although Smith’s argument shows that we may need to worry about \_\_\_\_\_\_, the majority of arguments pertaining to this topic show evidence to the contrary.)
11. Provide evidence for the writer’s view (or logical thinking, breaking down the rebuttal, etc.) as well as explanation to help the reader see why the writer’s position is the correct position to have (EX following earlier example: Both Andrew Brown and Harriet Blue’s research on the topic, for example, shows us that the concerns outlined in Smith’s work should be dismissed. Brown, for example, argues \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Blue’s research corroborates with Brown’s, moreover, and provides us with an even larger research pool from which to base findings. According to Blue, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Given the aforementioned studies, we are left to conclude that Smith’s argument somewhat flawed and that we should \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.)

Although the structure may differ slightly than that above, these elements should be present. Note below any missing element in the rebuttal paragraph, and note it on the paper.

1. Comment on the strength of the rebuttal paragraph—does it seem that this would be an argument that the opposing view would make? Does the summary of the opposing view’s argument make logical sense, and do you feel like the writer has given adequate time to the opposing view? Make notes on the paper and below:
2. Comment on the strength of the conclusion—is there a clear reiteration of the paper’s main points? And does the reader add some appropriate food for thought? What exactly is that “food for thought”?—is it detailing consequences of not doing what the writer has asked the audience to do? Is it further detailing something mentioned earlier in the paper? Etc.