

**Title:** The title gives the reader a clear idea of what issue the paper will address. With that said, I think you may *versus* and not “verses”.

**Thesis:** After reading the body of your paper, it is difficult to see connect your introductory paragraph to the rest of the paper. The end of your introduction paragraph muddles your thesis. Are you taking the stance that Kuhn is “oversimplifying the scientific method”? Are you following Hollinger’s position that the line Kuhn draws between normal and revolutionary science is “hard to sustain”? Will you attempt to draw a line using Hollinger as support? Consider more clearly defining the direction that rest of the paper will take.

**Thesis Support/Argument:** In addition to an unclear thesis, your argument does not have the definitions for terms (individual scientific thought, scientific models, etc.) that would allow the reader to connect the body of the paper to the introduction. By more clearly stating your thesis and clarifying what point you are trying to assert, you will be able to add a cohesiveness that this paper lacks. After reading your entire paper, it appears that you are arguing that the goal of scientists is to cause revolutionary science by maintaining an open-mind as to allow observations of anomalies. If that is the case, you may want to recast your thesis so that it is a reflection of that assertion.

### **Mechanics/Specific Quotations to Consider Addressing:**

#### **Page One**

- “...a widely accepted view.”
  - o Do you mean that the paradigm is a widely accepted view or that scientist being guided by a paradigm is a widely accepted view? You may wish to clarify that statement.
- “...in which a possible new paradigm is created.”
  - o Perhaps “in which a new paradigm can be created” would be a better way to phrase the end part of this sentence.
- “Hollinger stated that, “Kuhn went...”
  - o Minor detail: I do not believe that the comma is necessary to set off the quotation if you have “that” before the quote.
- “What if the scientists are wrong?”
  - o Wrong about what?

#### **Page Two:**

- “Kuhn’s scientific model seems especially vague in describing the early stages of paradigms.”
  - o Scientific model for what? For defining the transition from normal to revolutionary science? Or do you mean his definition of paradigms does not provide a clear description of the early stages of paradigms?
- ”The problem was that the idea of a spherical earth was so massive a change for people to accept, that the old paradigm of a flat earth was still accepted in Aristotle’s time.”

- Consider recasting this sentence. It appears as if “because” or “since” is missing from the sentence.
- Halfway through the paragraph that started on first page, it becomes difficult to follow your argument.
  - “Aristotle could not have known about scientists who believed that the earth was spherical centuries before he was born. Thus, the natural world must have caused this revolution in science.”
    - From where are making this conclusion? Does this follow Hollinger’s argument? Is it your intention to argue that the “natural world” caused this revolution to occur or was it Aristotle who made observations that contradicted the flat-earth paradigm which led to a revolution? Consider making the point you are trying to make clearer.
    - Also, was Aristotle the first to speculate that the earth was round? What about Pythagoras?
- “The natural world must create scientific progress.”
  - If the natural world creates scientific progress (and scientific revolutions according to your argument), then what role does a scientist play in science?
  - Also, after this sentence, you may want to add a transition that better leads the reader into the next paragraph.
- You may want to give the reader some idea of what you mean by “individual scientific thought”.

End of Page 2/ Page Three:

- “When such a bold scientist embarks on trying to break a paradigm, he is not merely building on the knowledge of normal science as Kuhn describes. More so, he is being open-minded to nature, personal observation and intuition. In this way, ‘normal science’ and ‘revolutionary science’ can blend together.
  - You stated earlier that “When scientists observe something that does not fit the paradigm, this area of science enters a time of ‘revolutionary science’ in which a possible new paradigm is created.”
    - If this is the case, then how are normal and revolutionary sciences blending together? Once the anomaly has been observed, is the scientist not now performing revolutionary science in order to adapt the preexisting paradigm to include the anomaly?
- “The way in which Kuhn describes individual scientific thought is accurate and further debunks his scientific model.”
  - The paragraph that follows this sentence does not clearly show how Kuhn’s idea of individual scientific thought debunks his scientific model. Are you asserting that Kuhn follows the model of being “bound by preconceptions” or the open-minded model?
- Consider adding a transition into the final paragraph.

Final Paragraph:

- While scientists often work within preexisting paradigms and use evidence of past scientists, they must rely not just on each other, but also on nature, to make revolutionary claims.
  - o If the goal of science is to explain/make predictions about occurrences in nature, is it not implied if science is performed that the observations and experiments done are based in nature?
- “Indeed, scientists exhibit very human qualities in their search for recognition and a scientific revolution.”
  - o Is this sentence necessary if you assume that the scientists are humans?