

Review: Popper and Kuhn: Where they Clash, How They Compliment Each Other, and Drawing Conclusions

- This is a good title, but it is a little confusing. You might try adding something about your use of Hutcheon and Narasimhan to do so.

Introduction

- Who is Charles Pierce? Telling the reader who he is will be helpful.
- Typo: "Hutcheon she is able to identify..." about 2/3 down the paragraph
- It might be necessary to do so, but you use the phrase "promising complimentary" twice in 3 lines
- You give Hutcheon more attention than Narasimhan.
- Your thesis is a little confusing. When I read it, it made me wonder why Narasimhan would "overlook" Hutcheon's argument. I know that is probably not what you wanted to say, but that is how I read it.
- **In general:** your idea is really good and fits well within the parameters he outlined for us.

Paragraph 2:

- When you say, "Hutcheon goes on to..." I became confused, because I didn't know that you were paraphrasing Hutcheon's work. Be more explicit about this in the beginning of the paragraph.
- Typo: "Kuhn further an argument that..." furthers?

- I think a concluding sentence will help wrap together the point you are trying to make in this paragraph.
- **In general:** you used quotes very well to enhance your argument, and your language is great and concise.

Paragraph 3:

- Why do you use quotes around “‘essential’ nature of reality.”? Are you quoting something? You should cite it.
- **In general:** I don’t know what this paragraph is adding to the paper. What exactly is its purpose? Why is it so short?

Paragraph 4:

- Maybe define “pragmatists.” It will clarify your argument.
- **In general:** This paragraph could use a topic sentence as well. I don’t know whether its purpose is to show that Kuhn and Popper had similar ideas or to compare and contrast what Hutcheon and Narasimhan thought of Kuhn and Popper’s similarities. Ending with a quote is not very strong. A concluding sentence would help.

Paragraph 5:

- **In General:** This one has a topic sentence, but it is confusing. You use the word evidence twice within few words, which muddles your idea. The addition of a concluding sentence would clarify the purpose of this paragraph. Your language and conciseness is, once again, good.

Paragraph 6:

- Typo: “as opposed to thy Kuhnian idea of periodic breakthroughs and plateaus”
- The second and third sentences are both good topic sentences, but they are different topics. I don’t know if they belong in the same paragraph. Each of them sort of begin arguments that you do not back up with evidence.
- **In General:** The idea of this paragraph is confused by the second and third sentences. I don’t know which topic you are pursuing in the paragraph. Once again, a concluding sentence would help to clarify.

Conclusion

- The first two sentences start with Hutcheon. Starting with a pronoun would make it less awkward.
- You write about Hutcheon in the present tense, but when you start with Narasinhham, you are in the past tense (“viewed”)
- **In General:** This paragraph does not really conclude anything. Throughout it, you contradict Hutcheon and Narasinhham well, but you don’t conclude anything about those contradictions. You essentially just say that they exist. When you clarify your thesis, it will be easier to conclude more here.

Overall: Your idea is great, and you use very concise, formal language (with no excess modifiers or fluff) to get your point across. However, I think you need to clarify what exactly that point is. By taking apart each paragraph and essentially giving each a thesis, your argument will come through clearly in the end. Your

transitions from paragraph to paragraph are good in general, but they could be connected a bit more. When you start a paragraph with Hutcheon and finish with Narasimham, it is confusing. You might want to introduce the differences or similarities between the two in an opening sentence before diving into their respective ideas. This paper is overall very well written, and I can tell you know what you are talking about. It just needs a little clarification.