

Writing I

Writer's Name

Ashline

Reviewer's Name

PEER REVIEW WORKSHOP FOR SUMMARY/STRONG RESPONSE ESSAY

Instructions: Exchange papers with a partner and complete the following list of questions in as much detail as possible on your partner's paper after reviewing the paper. Be as constructively critical as you possibly can so that the writer of the paper has a chance to improve it significantly on revision. You may comment as well on the draft, but do not make any changes for the writer during workshop. Instead, point out areas of strength and weakness that the writer can improve through their own effort.

1. How appealingly do the title and introduction of the essay set up the topic of the critique, convey the writer's interest, and lay a foundation for the summary of the article and the writer's thesis?

=> The most remarkable strength of your essay is 'unity and consistency'. You have one clear thesis (statement) and spent your whole paper to support it. You well-summarized (arranged) your claim in one phrase and used it as title. It is very easy to find the connection between your title and the content (also it is related with one of the main points (resolutions) suggested in Mercola's article). However, one thing is missing. As you said, it seems like you spent not enough time in deciding your title. Of course, stimulus and sensational title is not always the best (Clear and obvious title is better for academic writing according to one of my professors). But if you want to draw more attention from readers, consider changing your title in more vague and figurative way. One example I can think of right now; "What is under the dark sea (veil) of cell phone industry." Well, this example is not at all satisfactory but anyway, the decision lays on you. (①)

Oh, and about the introduction! You just started your essay with the summary. You wrote four pages, so you have enough space. Think about related cases or your personal experiences and use it as introduction. It will help. (After you write your introduction, let's talk about it later.)

2. In what way do the opening sentences of the summary provide needed contextual information and then express the overall thesis of the text? What information could be added or more clearly stated?

=> Your opening sentences of the summary looks fine. It obviously covers entire needed information and you well-followed the criteria for summary professor suggested. But about the word 'excessive' (②), I think you should think about it one more time. Well, of course, excessive use of something always brings up a problem and Mercola also worries about that issue but he also suggests the harmfulness of cell phone ITSELF. He shows us lots of evidence how electromagnetic frequencies from cell phone can have influence on us even when we don't actually (literally) USE it. Expression like "Dr. Joseph Mercola argues that cell phone itself and excessive use of it holds responsible~" would be better.

3. How would you evaluate the writer's presentation and coverage of the text's main ideas in terms of accuracy, balance, and proportion? What ideas have been omitted or overemphasized?

=> About accuracy, I have some opinions. I already mentioned about the expression 'excessive' (②) in the previous question. Let's see the ③ point I checked in your sheet. I

completely understand your sentence and why you wrote it this way. However, strictly speaking, the FDA never set or directly involved in making standards. The FDA just appeared in assumption to discuss the locus of responsibility. I think you should use 'FDA' like this; and the FDA which sets guidelines for overall security matters doesn't actually care much about~.

Let's move on to ⑥ point. Well, we can clearly infer from the article that health agencies don't pay proper attention on this matter. However, to be precise, Camilla Rees just mentioned about health agencies to emphasize FCC is not a proper one to decide the standard. So I think you should also use health agencies just for comparison or emphasis effect. In case you want to use your sentence as it is, think about new expression. You are repeating the similar expression.

About ⑧ point, I think you should mention the resource. Actually the whole paragraph about poor academic performance and anxiety in Mercola's article is simply a summary of other research (actually we read the original one for our journal) not his personal study or opinion.

By the way, balance and proportion of summary was impressive (especially the solution part. You summarized it in one sentence).

4. How could the summary use signal phrases more effectively to keep the focus on the original author's ideas?

=> I don't see any serious problem. Well, the ⑧ point I mentioned above can have a little relationship with this one since it is not the author's ideas. You need another signal phrase. You used Mercola suggests~, Mercola focus on~, etc. Not typical enough!

5. Has the writer used quotations sparingly, judiciously, and cited them accurately? Has the writer translated points into his or her own words? Has the writer included a Work Cited entry as well?

=> You paraphrased well. You should just reconsider ③ and ⑥ point I checked. (It's controversial. Maybe my point is wrong.)

6. Where might the writer's choice of words and phrasing of sentences be revised to improve the clarity, conciseness, and coherence of the summary?

=> Point ④ is really trivial one but 'take serious consideration into~' seems more natural to me. And if you are going to use your original sentence, I think 'should be' is better than 'are' (⑤). About point □, I think you should use more negative word than 'change'. The word 'change' can mean both positive and negative transition but you obviously mean negative one in this sentence. Let's see point □, I think you can cut off the sentence at that point like this; ~avoid, reduce and replace the cell phone. Keeping distance from your mobile phone as far as possible will protect you from~. It can have emphasis effectiveness, I guess.

Point □, it doesn't have specific problem. But, you can just say 'the threat of cell phone'.

Point ⑩ is quite important. If you want to use this sentence, you must say 'There are' in the previous sentence. 'Readers' exist only when there are actual papers, don't they?

You can erase the expression 'to public' (⑰). There's no way we can know the mind of others. By the way, it is natural enough without these words.

Point ⑱, "actually using it" would be more appropriate than "making a call" since we use cell phone for many reasons.

Point ②③, you need to add 'from this article'. We, the common people, usually don't think and imagine about this problem, do we? We can only assume these problems after reading this kind of article.

Point ②④, I want to ask "operation of what?" You can give some example. It seems a little bit awkward.

Point 27, same question. "effects of what?" You need to be more specific.

Point 28, "opinion" is more appropriate than "matter" in this position.

Point 29, I checked on your paper. If you change the order of this sentence, it will be read more naturally.

Point 30, delete the comma.

Point 32, simply saying "people think" can do.

Point 33, I want to ask "Majority? Really?" As far as I know, the number hasn't reached majority yet. You can just say "considerable number of~". This expression can support your point sufficiently.

7. For the response, how could the writer's thesis statement be clearer in presenting several focused points about the text's rhetorical strategies and ideas?

=> Actually you focused on only one point among several ideas in the text. You said you want to deal with more points, so you'd better think about it. Since you concentrated on one thesis, your consistency and unity of essay is really great right now. Try to keep your strength while you add some more points suggested in the article. (Adding some critical views will be helpful for your paper)

8. How could the body of the strong response follow the thesis more closely?

=> Point ⑱ shows it. It's about a connection (flow) problem. In previous paragraph you were talking about harmfulness (malicious influence) of cell phone and next paragraph is about a big secret (conspiracy) between government and market. You need some sentences between two paragraphs for better connection. Well, you can add something like; "Even though fatal influence of cell phone on our body is obvious like this, many people don't know about it or they don't remind themselves of it properly. Why? There seems to be possible conspiracy between government and cell phone industry." (My example is really rough as I write it off the top of my head. Sorry.)

Let's look at point 25. I think you'd better mention about post-market investigation. (since you only mentioned pre-market regulation) You gave rational reason why you think pre-market investigation is much more important than post-market regulation but I think you should mention about post-market regulation too and then emphasize the significance of pre-market one. This way, you can be more close to Mercola's thesis (you seem like totally agree with Mercola) and be more reasonable.

Point 26, the paragraph I checked in your paper can be connected with the previous one. Those two paragraphs are talking about the possible solution and both are about more investigation even though the subject is different. It is good to have detailed paragraphs but you have too many small paragraphs. The decision lay on you.

9. Where do you, the reader, need more clarification or support for the writer's points? How could the writer develop with-the-grain or against-the-grain points more appropriately?

=> Let's see point □. You mentioned there is no practical measure and that is true. But, you can suggest some possible factors like small monitor and fonts of cell phone compared to personal computer. Just saying there's no measure seems not enough.

You clearly wrote with-the-grain essay and as I said before, unity and consistency is good. I think it's appropriate enough.

10. Where could the writer work on effectiveness of signal phrases, quotations and documentation?

=> I will discuss the problem regarding this category below (Question 11).

11. When quotations are used, they should be introduced with a brief sense of the significance of the quotation as well as a signal phrase, and glossed, that is, interpreted or paraphrased as well. In the case of this draft, has the writer carried out both tasks for each quotation? In what places would you suggest improvement and why?

=> Let's see Point ⑳. Well, this can be controversial. This is about your interpretation of quotation. It seems that you think FCC made such unreasonable regulation to benefit from it. That's possible assumption from this quotation. However, it is 'possible' but not 'objective' enough. I think you went too far from the original intention of the author. In my point of view, Mercola used these sentences just to reveal it is not FCC that should set the guidelines but the health agencies filled with experts in that area. You can obviously talk about conniving between government and market since we all know there actually is some conspiracy going on but saying these sentences are the clues for big secret and big danger is not plausible enough. Add some more sentences for interpretation that can give readers more sense.

Point ㉑, ㉒ is about same problem. We know government is deeply related with the 'benefits' and it is in collusion with some agencies for that but you need another example or quotation to support your statement because it is a little bit out of Mercola's intention.

12. Note below and on the draft any consistent problems with grammar and mechanics. Where can the writer make efforts to improve the grammar of the assignment?

=> Well, you are really good writer. You are not making any 'consistent' mistake so I am just going to point out some minor ones. Point □, deleting 'that' seems more natural at least for me. Point □, 'Mercola suggests us to~' looks fine. Point □, insert '-ing' at the end of the word seems more correct from grammatical view. Point □, delete 's' at the end of the word since the subject is 'several other works'.

Point 34, you'd better use plural form.

13. Summarize below the overall strengths and weaknesses of the writer's paper. Be as specific and detailed as possible.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unity and Consistency of thesis and supporting paragraphs - Sentence structure is great. You are a good writer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No critical points. You focus on one thesis. You can add some more points from other aspects for diversity. - You need introduction. And if you want, you'd better change your title into more interesting form. - Some wrong interpretations (from my point of view)

It is hard to divide my reviews into two sections, so please read it carefully (with patience) and let's discuss. There are some controversial points.