

Paper 1

Intro

- 1) You need to explain both theories a little more to help the reader better understand why the two contrast each other so much
- 2) Not quite sure what your thesis is (I assume you take Hutcheon's side from the rest of your paper but it needs to be clear in the intro)

Paragraph 2

- 1) I think there are two separate ideas here which both deserve their own respective paragraphs

Paragraph 3

- 1) What is "essential nature of reality?"
- 2) I don't see what Kuhn's argument and Hutcheon's argument have to do with each other in this paragraph

Paragraph 4

- 1) Their efforts to separate science and ideology are irrelevant to your thesis
- 2) What does religious conversion have to do with this essay?
- 3) Very confusing paragraph (you need better transitions to separate different thoughts)

Paragraph 5

- 1) First sentence is a contradiction that makes no sense. Are you trying to say that the evidence *seems* to prove their difference?
- 2) Different points are not well enough explained in this paragraph. Very little depth.

Paragraph 6

- 1) I don't see the conflict in Kuhn's and Popper's ideas at the end of the paragraph. Take some time to explain the quotations in your own words.

Conclusion

- 1) Clear conclusion, but you merely explain what Hutcheon and Narasimham think. What do you think? Why is this comparison even important at all? What are the implications of one view winning over the other?
- 2) Intro supports Hutcheons (I think) but conclusion supports neither. You need to make sure they both agree.

Overall

- 1) There are a lot of subtle grammatical mistakes
 - ex. 1 "It has been said that the epistemological premises of Thomas Kuhn and Karl Popper have every reason to negate one another." (the premises of the two men do not negate each other; the mens' theories negate each other)
 - ex. 2 "Generally speaking, a theory's "unfitness" and falsification, Popper's and Kuhn's ideas, respectively, share a common perspective on the growth of scientific

knowledge.” (single theory shares perspective, a lot of agreement mistakes throughout)
- Not the only two grammatical problems, just highlights of some of the common ones

2) Missing a couple citations for quotes

3) Need clearer transitions or new paragraphs to better separate different thoughts

4) You use a lot of terms that you do not explicitly define

5) I fear that you have merely summarized the views you read and have not drawn any new conclusions. Your analysis of the subject matter at hand must have some sort of significance for people to read it.