

## Paper 1

Overall, this paper has a lot of promise. The area that most requires attention is the lost trace of your argument focal point. The connection to Behe has to be referenced more regularly so the reader can see how each point relates to the general argument. Good research went into this paper and you utilized examples well. It may be a good idea to cite some of the examples used in your paper, ie E Coli Bacteria.

- Give some examples of your phenotypes, you may go to them later in the paper, but it would be a good idea to give some examples of them in the introduction.
- Be more specific on your statement regarding probability, possibly a cited example to increase the validity of your claim.
- “gather support” seems to not fit. Behe uses the misconception to build his arguments but that is not necessarily gathering support. Furthermore you could possibly define his misconceptions and explore them in more detail instead of stating he has made them.
- Fallacy is a very good point. Points out flaws, however, in this instance and in the paper in general, a number of times you make the appearance of proving natural selection to be a faulty argument as the main part of evolution. You do reference Behe having made the misconception, but there needs to be some guiding topic sentences that allow the reader to follow your argument a little more clearly. It is not until the end that I realized you were disproving natural selection in specific areas to disprove Behe and verify that

his take on evolution is not as accurate as he claims. It appeared more so that it was a paper intended to attack Neo-Darwinism rather than Behe through Neo-Darwinism.

- You reference Behe saying that the probability is too low so it cannot be true. That point is good enough and deserves more attention. It was also a reference to Behe, which is a much more direct reference to your original thesis.
- Quotes are the most convincing when your own opinions are coupled with the quote. A stand-alone quote with no specific analysis is much easier to wash over as a reader.
- The Phenotypes and fruitflies is a fair amount of complicated detail but later on you state that there is no need to explain the existence of phenotypes. This confirmation because it poses the possibility to confuse the reader.
- The E-coli bacteria section involves a lot of complicated description. This may parallel what we criticized Behe for doing so much of in his book during discussions. Make sure your point is clearly made in a simple fashion to increase clarity.