Responding to Essay 1: Peer Review of Drafts

Please consider the following guidelines as you respond to your colleague's draft. Most drafts, professional and otherwise, will have some gaps between what the writer intends and what happens on the page, and most will also have some problems in the relationship between evidence and idea. That's why writers show their drafts to readers they trust. Each of you is in the position of trusted reader here: your most important function is to give the author insight into the experience of reading the essay. *

1. *As you read, record your thoughts using the highlight + comment tool in Canvas.*
    - Include your "gists" of what each paragraph is saying and note any insights you find valuable:
        - OK, you're showing me that Durbach provides convincing evidence of working class victories against the enforcement of compulsory vaccination here
        - I understand this paragraph to be saying [x]…
        - Oh, now I see why you brought up [x]; it seems like your point is [x]
        - This is a really great point; I hadn't thought of making that connection before
        - This example is what really convinced me of your claim that Flanigan has an inconsistent approach to liability

    - Note places where you stumbled or struggled to understand
        - This word makes me pause; I think of "social agenda" as a positive term, but it seems like you are using it in a negative way
        - I'm having trouble with this sentence; I had to go back and read it a couple times
        - I think you already said this; or is there something different here that I missed?
        - I don't know what you mean by [x]
        - Based on the end of the last paragraph, I expected you to talk about [y] next so I was surprised to see [x]
        - I'm having a hard time making a connection between this paragraph and the last one. Is the connection that they are both about individualism? That's my guess but I'm not sure if it's what you intended.

2. *Next, consider these questions, linked to the three purposes of the review:*

    - Does the piece **inform** the reader about the argument of the source being reviewed? Is there any place where more context would be needed for someone who has not read the original source to be able to follow? Does the author provide a "generous" reading of the source—that is, do they give the reader a sense of why a reasonable person (Flanigan, Durbach, or Hausman) would come to the conclusions that they do, even if the author disagrees? Make a note if there is a place where more **context** on the argument of the source would be helpful.

- What is the author's **stance** on/ **evaluation** of the source? Can you sum it up in one sentence? Where do you find their stance stated most explicitly? Which of the author's claims about the source did you find most convincing, and why? Are there any claims that could use more **evidence**, reasons, or **analysis** to be convincing? Can you think of any other **counterarguments** that the author should consider? How might the author of the original paper respond?

- Where does the author give you an understanding of the **significance** and **implications** of their analysis for the broader question being considered—or for public discussions of vaccine hesitancy today, or policy? Are there any additional implications that they have not considered? What could they do to amplify the **motive** of the paper?

3. *Finally, consider the overall structure of the paper and its sense of "**movement**"*

- Is the order of ideas logical? Do the paragraphs seem to build on each other? Can you think of any changes to the order of ideas that would improve the flow? Are there any places where more of a transition is needed to help the reader understand the connections between sections?

Write a summary comment that touches on the questions above, emphasizing one or two priorities that you think the author should focus on. Start with what you think is the *best thing* about their draft.

Once you've finished writing up your comments, talk through any questions you had or comments that might benefit from further clarification (again, starting with what you liked best).

*Reader response protocol and examples adapted from Giltrow et al., *Academic Writing: An Introduction,* 4th ed., Broadview Press, 2021. Thanks to colleagues in the former Expository Writing Program for some of the introductory language.