

SCIENCE AND RELIGION
GRADED PAPER 2 REVIEWS
MWANZAA BROWN

Paper 1

Your review is too informal and riddling with mechanical writing errors. Write a proper document.

You do highlight critical flaws in the paper, and you state those flaws clearly. Good job. More depth and detail in the review would be appropriate, though.

Grade: A- and late submission → B.

Paper 2

A review is not a conversation with your author. It should be a structured document designed to help your author thoroughly and easily identify problems and understand them. Your review reads like a transcript of an informal discussion. It is full of sentence fragments, ambiguous or undefined antecedents, and grammar/punctuation errors, making this document difficult to digest.

You also fail to pull together a few critical observations into a coherent criticism of this paper. You need to provide a critique of the larger picture, but you comment only on the smaller pieces.

(1) The goal of the author's paper should **not** be to show a clear progression of thoughts. The paper should **present an argument**. The author's thought process is immaterial, and should be subordinate to a clear, flowing, compelling presentation.

Grade: B and late submission → C+.

Far

Way too much repetition. Also there isn't much time spent explicitly proving your thesis. Too much time is spent proving that a scientist can be religious, which no one is arguing, so throw that out. There is a lot of fluff, and sentences that don't add anything.

informal like what?

You do seem to know a bit about the individuals. I'd suggest rewriting it from that standpoint. Explain how religion is important to the four scientists, then draw a conclusion about how religion affects the 40% of believing scientists.

Bad advice.

In the first paragraph you don't need to say "this paper will prove" / "this essay will demonstrate" and so on. You should make your thesis a bit more clear, perhaps putting it towards the end of the paragraph. Be really careful not to add vague sentences or sentences that don't add to your point.

For example: it needs some guidance when it comes to the natural world and must accept the ideas that science has to offer

Instead perhaps explain why religion has to accept those ideas.

About proving that a scientist can be religious. We've learned that 40% of scientists consider themselves religious. Therefore you can't really prove that a scientist can be religious because it would seem obvious since there are so many. Instead use that fact to strengthen your thesis, explain how religion affects them. However, you can't just say it gives them faith. What does that mean, not just defined by Collins, but how does it effect the scientists practice?

①

grammar
awk.

Not bad at all. I can see the clear progression of your thoughts. You should be careful not to assume that the reader knows what you are talking about and take more pains in making the subject of your sentences clear and making sure following sentences flow with the ones before. Your thesis is a bit drastic: "the inevitable conflict (not conflicting) of perspectives prohibits science and religion to coexist" They have co-existed for quite sometime now, perhaps not peacefully, but its coexistence none the less.

/ Yes.

"as a means of denying the validity of a hypothesis illustrates a significant reason why religion and science are irreconcilable."

grammar & punct.

Huh?

- science denies the validity of hypothesis' all the time. I think the problem is when religion denies something that's not a hypothesis. Also be careful because the evidence you use for this is the guy saying that we should think about other things. That doesn't really discredit the hypothesis it just says knowing would be useless. There are other things the church said that would help you better here.

Unclear & unhelpful.
-> punctuation

grammar

Note that religion does use some kind of evidence. Its just not based on anything that can be measured. However their claims are backed by the Bible.

Second page, first paragraph, second and third sentence:
Too much repetition.

End of the paragraph: "both of which we non-scientific expeditions" what does this mean?

Third page end of continued paragraph: "the later will be discussed first..."
You don't need this at all.

First full paragraph: You should tie this in better to your thesis. Right now it just shows what he thinks of religion, not how religion and science cannot exist together. If you perhaps show that a scientist thinks it inconsistent with science to believe religion that would be stronger.

awk.

Last page, first continuing paragraph: "prevented the church from..."
The church did have an argument for quite some time, it just fell apart.

"the church made to Galileo to recant his discoveries"
clarity and grammar!

And your conclusion is kind of weak right now. Don't just restate your introduction. Elaborate on it.