

Paper 1: "Irreducibly Flawed: The Argument Against Behe" Review

Summary:

- Thesis: Behe's argument of irreducible complexity is not a valid scientific argument because it is neither provable nor falsifiable.
- Behe uses incomplete evidence, and ignores evidence that contradicts his theories.
- Behe's central arguments can easily be disproved, and there exists copious amounts of evidence that contradict him.
- Explanation and counterargument against mousetrap, eye, flagellum, immune system, etc.

General/Specific Comments:

- Title/Intro
 - I really liked your title. Not only is it straight to the point, but also it is also clever. Well done.
 - This is very nitpicky, but I would put a comma after "Darwin's Black Box" in the first sentence.
 - Very solid introduction – it is clear and concise, contains a definite thesis statement, and sets you up nicely for the rest of the paper. I understand what you're going to about, you've piqued my interest, and I'm ready to read more.
- Paragraph 1:
 - Starting with a definition of irreducible complexity was a good idea – since that is what much of the paper is about, its good to make sure the reader knows what you're talking about.
 - In your fourth sentence, you use the phrase "now famous". I don't really think the word 'now' is necessary – it suffices just to say his famous analogy.
 - Elaborate more on your tie clip example: does that really count as being reducible if it doesn't serve the original function? Behe's point was that you wouldn't be able to take parts away and still maintain the original function – not that you couldn't take parts away and create some new function. I'm not sure this is a valid example, but maybe some more elaboration on this example could make it work.
- Paragraph 2:
 - I would rephrase the first sentence. It's kind of redundant, because we already know what you proved in your last paragraph: we read it. I'm also not a huge fan of the use of the word "we". I think you could probably find a better way to start this paragraph.
 - In your fifth sentence, I don't think "contrived" is the right word you are looking for. 'Created' would better suit your purposes.
 - Your fact about the telescope is very interesting, but it comes off as overall irrelevant. Maybe find a way to tie it in more?

- Nothing is proved in this paragraph. I understand that this paragraph is meant to set up your argument in the next paragraph, but it reads a little flat. I would try and make some kind of point in this paragraph.
- Paragraph 3
 - You mention an experiment that proves that an eye can evolve over hundreds of years, but you don't explain what the experiment is. I was intrigued by this comment, and wanted to know more. What was the experiment? How did it prove this? Elaborate more.
 - Also, do you know that Behe is aware of this experiment? I would include proof of this.
- Paragraph 4
 - Very nice transition between this paragraph and the last one. It flows very smoothly.
 - I'm not sure if your three-protein argument stands up: Behe was arguing more in terms of parts rather than proteins. I think he was aware that each part would be composed of a bunch of other stuff as well.
 - Also, your last 2-3 sentences are a little confusing and I think could use some reworking. You say that the minimal amount of proteins is only three, which implies that there could be three or more. Yet you complain that he can't reduce "about 40". If its more than three, why does it matter?
- Paragraph 5
 - You're really focused on this whole "about 40" thing, and it's coming off a little too sarcastic. We get it – you think there's a problem with Behe's about 40 proteins. Either use it to prove another point or just let it go already.
 - Your bacterium/flagellum example is a little confusing and I think requires more explanation. If the bacterium is something different than the flagellum, how can it be used to demonstrate that the flagellum is reducible? Maybe I'm just missing the point, but I don't think you can go wrong with a little more clarification.
- Conclusion
 - You lose me in the conclusion. You've been so well, and then you start to fall apart here. You introduce the idea of the immune system, which I think would serve better in its own body paragraph rather than being inserted into the conclusion.
 - At the end, you also start to assert that science is fact, and nothing else is fact, and that because irreducible complexity is not science, it can't be fact. I think you're starting to veer off from hard evidence here and starting to make assertions. Your intro was so beautiful; I would try to model your conclusion after it.
- Overall:
 - I loved your paper! It was very well written and very well argued. I know I probably came off as very nitpicky in my review, and that was

only because it was so hard to find things to critique. It was a pleasure to read, you had a coherent thesis, and you proved it up until the end. I think with just a little tweaking, you're in great shape for the final draft. Nice work!