

Paper 1 Review

General Comments

- A. Your paper has a lot of potential. There are two significant things I think you could do to improve it. First, develop an assertive claim to support. You do a lot of summary of what Kuhn and Hudson believe, but what do you believe? It wasn't entirely clear to me as a reader. Make this argument into a concise, clear thesis statement in your introductory paragraph so your reader knows what you are trying to prove. In your body paragraphs, don't just provide quotes as evidence, analyze the quotes you use to prove your point. This will make your paper much more interesting and meaningful. Second, consider your organization. Your summaries of the positions held by Kuhn and Hudson were at times vague and difficult to understand. After you develop your thesis, your main idea, decide what points you want to make in order to prove your central claim and in what order you want to make them. Every topic sentence of each body paragraph and the content of those paragraphs should link back to your thesis and support it. I might use the example of oxygen *as* you are explaining the discovery criteria of Hudson and Kuhn, not after— a concrete example will make their ideas more relevant and accessible to readers. You should also add a separate paragraph for your conclusion, which should not be merely a summary of your major points, but should demonstrate the link between your thesis and body evidence and the significance of your assertions. Clarify your central argument and use a stronger organizational format to support it.
- B. There were a few small formatting questions I had when I read your paper. The margins appeared to be larger than one inch. I don't think you need to put a date below your title, and the title itself could be bolded, italicized, or underlined, but probably just one is enough for emphasis. I was taught to add ellipses to quotes if they break into the middle of a sentence— I would write, for instance, that "...all the relevant conceptual categories...are prepared in advance." This could just be a stylistic difference, but maybe check. Also, I don't know if you need a full bibliography or if footnote citations would suffice. It might be worth asking Professor Kaplan just to make sure you're giving credit where it is due.
- C. I would have appreciated a complete paper to review so that my comments would be truly relevant to the strengths and weaknesses of your work.

Specific Commentary

Title and Introductory Paragraph

- A. Once you develop your thesis, your central claim, summarize that idea in your title. Right now your title, although relevant and specific, seems to indicate a summary rather than a persuasive analysis.
- B. In the first sentence, the prepositional phrase "...in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*" could be placed after "argues" rather than "Kuhn" for clarity and flow. Also, books are usually underlined rather than italicized.
- C. There should not be any quotes in your introductory paragraph. They should serve as springboards for analysis in your body paragraphs. Paraphrase any pertinent background information rather than quoting it in your introduction.
- D. "However" at the beginning of the third sentence should have a comma after it. A different transition might work better in this specific spot ("On the other hand,..." or "Conversely..." for example).
- E. Avoid repetitive sentence beginnings and word choice ("...described in the basic description," "...the demonstration must actually demonstrate," "...if the discoverer can meet a set of criteria, the discovery can be accepted").
- F. The dashes around "...in the context of the description" are not necessary.
- G. I'm not sure, but there might need to be an -s after "perspective" in the final sentence because Kuhn and Hudson do not share the same point of view.

Body Paragraph 1

- A. See general comments about topic sentences— they should link back to your thesis and let your reader know what you are trying to convey in the coming paragraph.
- B. Again, I think your explanations of Kuhn and Hudson's beliefs would be much clearer to readers if you used oxygen as an example while detailing their assertions.

Body Paragraph 2

- A. Avoid ambiguity. Conceptualization of what?

- B. Maybe use “argues,” “asserts,” or “claims” instead of “states” unless you mention where an argument is stated (“...Hudson states in *Discoveries: When and by Whom?* that...”).
- C. It was unclear to me at first who the “he” was in the second sentence. It seemed to refer back to the discoverer rather than Hudson.
- D. This might just be my stylistic preference, but I would not end a paragraph with a rhetorical question.

Body Paragraph 3

- A. Again, help your reader out by being very specific about what exactly you mean. What’s presence? The next step of what?
- B. Clarify the clause “Dependent on the validity of the base description” to ensure it relates well to the main clause of the sentence.
- C. See general comments— incorporate more analysis and less summary.

Body Paragraph 4

- A. Why is it relevant that novelty and truth are the simplest criteria? Make sure the ideas in your topic sentences are claims you are actually trying to prove in order to establish your central claim.
- B. “The” is unnecessary before the second sentence.
- C. Also in the second sentence, a novelty condition cannot state because it is not a person.

Body Paragraph 5

- A. I felt that in this paragraph you were finally starting to draw conclusions about the information you had gathered. That was good, but you need evidence (quotes and analysis of them) to support each of the claims you make, and I didn’t see that in this last paragraph. Structure your paper so that in your body paragraphs there is a clear topic sentence, some context/background information, a quote for evidence, and then lots of analysis. This will make your arguments much more believable.
- B. See general comments about conclusions.