

Review of Paper Number Two (Assignment Two)

First Paragraph:

- In the second sentence, what is the subject that “therefore caused many reactions?” The phrase is vague and a little confusing.
- “One of Kuhn’s opinion” needs an “s.”
- The phrase “edited by David Papineau” should be offset by commas.
- You mention that Laudan refutes “this idea Kuhn presents” without previously stating what the idea is. All you’ve said is that it deals with scientific methodology. If you aren’t ready to give a summary of Kuhn’s theory, avoid general statements about it.
- Later in the sentence, you say “it raises the question that both can be right.” That isn’t really a question. Also, try to avoid vague subjects like “it” and also clarify what “both” are. So far, you’ve only mentioned Kuhn’s proposal but haven’t said anything about an alternative proposal besides the fact that Laudan has refuted Kuhn.

Second Paragraph:

- Cite the source your quotation is from with an internal citation.
- The following sentence “Under...methodology” is not a complete sentence. I’m not positive what you mean to say, but I think you are just missing a word or two.
- You need a comma after “In scientific methodology...” The latter half of that sentence is vague. What is “it?” What do you mean by “original ideas?” Ideas opposed to ones that have been thought of before?
- Remove the word “seen” in “Each methodology is seen as...” It is clear that you are speaking from the perspective of “scientific methodology.”
- The process of biology *is* different from physics. You don’t need future tense.
- A comma belongs after “recent times” and before “and.” Later in the sentence, you refer to “what arguments were presented for this issue to reoccur.” It’s unclear what arguments or what issue you refer to.
- Then last two sentences of the paragraph are a question and then a statement, but the statement doesn’t answer the question. What is the “unification” you mention? You need to connect the two sentences in a clearer way (perhaps alter the question so that you can provide the answer that you want to provide).

Third Paragraph:

- You should combine the ideas of your first three sentences into one thought about how Kuhn originally perceived scientific methodology as sound and without need of alteration. You may want to remove the part about how “he viewed it as it stood” because that is sort of unclear.
- What do you mean by Kuhn’s methods are not “intrusive?” Do you mean not conflicting?
- “The correct one would sort itself out and the correct one would prevail...” could be revised to something more like “the correct one would naturally prevail.”

- In the following two sentences, you can omit “begins to,” “made,” “or irrational,” “argues,” and “or.” All are unnecessary words.
- The concluding sentence of this paragraph is a non sequitur. Why do we “have to” look at the history of methodologies because Laudan questions Kuhn?

Fourth Paragraph:

- Your first sentence is unclear. Whose opinions is Laudan addressing? Do you mean he evaluates previous theories? What do you mean by “forms of how a decision is made?” You haven’t mentioned this before.
- Your quotation is introduced by “he defines it as...” but is not a definition of anything. Clarify that one doctrine, the rationality thesis, states...
- “There is nothing” can be changed to “nothing is” to avoid the passive voice. Later in that sentence, you may want to remove and, and add a semicolon instead.
- You should replace “in which” with “that” in the sentence “the second doctrine in which Kuhn supports...”
- Later, you write that scientists “show” flaws, but I think you mean they find flaws.
- You refer to facts based on “lies or inferences.” Because of the negative connotation, you may want to change it to “misinterpreted data” or something less emotionally charged.
- In the next sentence, there may be missing words; I’m not really sure what you are trying to say. What do you mean by initiatives? Do you mean subsequent choices?
- You can tighten the concluding sentence by removing “their own” and “on given issues.”

Fifth Paragraph

- The first sentence is set up to introduce a refutation, but the opinion of Kuhn’s that you mention isn’t a refute.
- What does the “it” in the next sentence refer to?
- In the sentence “He argues that...” you should remove the “and”
- “It causes *one* to think for *himself*...*his* own perspective...than *his* neighbor.” Don’t switch between one, themselves, and your (choose one and be consistent).
- The phrase “in this factor” is unclear.
- You state “For example...” and then mention Einstein’s theory of relativity, but I’m not sure how this is an example of theories becoming more general. What do you mean by “classical mechanics?” Also, “anyone...their” is not parallel.
- “Kuhn would determine them to be insufficient...” could be changed to “Kuhn would deem them insufficient” for precision.
- In the last sentence, how does the fact that Kuhn has not yet addressed a specific issue “show another flaw?” You haven’t said he *can’t* address it, he just hasn’t *yet*.

Sixth Paragraph:

- You may want to use a more precise word than “has everything.” Consider “addresses.” Also “does not create any” could be changed to “eliminates.”

- Avoid using “it” and “this” in the beginning of sentences without specifying what they refer to.
- The phrase “jumps to become more specific” is confusing.
- Instead of methodologies creating rules “versus” possibilities, you may want to say “as opposed to.”
- A comma belongs after “With rationality,” in the beginning of the next sentence. Later in that sentence, there can be a conclusion *that* x will produce y (I think this was a typo).

Seventh Paragraph:

- Your first sentence is vague and does not add anything. You state that Kuhn argues for a “meta-methodological idea” without having mentioned this idea before. The last paragraph is too late to slide in this term.
- Again, I would avoid the term “lies” which implies intentional misrepresentation.