**Gov 50.08 Analytical Paper Draft Peer Review Guidelines**

* Read the paper once completely, without writing anything down.
* Read it a second time and provide responses to each of the following prompts/questions.
* Peer comments are due Friday, May 17 at 11:59pm. You should email your peer comment worksheet to the paper’s author and cc me at Kathleen.e.powers@dartmouth.edu. Comments must be delivered to both the author and to me by the deadline; late submissions will be penalized in the final paper grade.
* Peer comments should aim to offer constructive suggestions for improvement. Completing a constructive peer review will factor into the final paper grade. Specifically, peer comments should do the following to earn full completion credit:
	1. Respond to the paper charitably and constructively, in a helpful spirit. This is the most important criterion.
	2. Demonstrate careful and thorough engagement with the paper.
	3. Offer comments and suggestions that are thoughtfully considered and insightful.
1. Reconstruct the paper’s argument. What is the central claim, and how does the author support their argument? Think about writing an abstract – summarize the paper in about 3-5 sentences, in your own words, based on your reading of it.
2. Has the paper made a compelling substantive case for the validity of the argument/analytical framework? If not, how might the author address your concerns about whether this theory/framework applies to their case?
3. Identify the paragraph or paragraph that offers the **strongest** support for the author’s argument. Why is this evidence or analysis particularly compelling?
4. Identify the paragraph or paragraphs that currently offer the **weakest** support for the main argument. What would make this piece of evidence or analysis more compelling?
5. In general, is the paper organized logically and transparently? In other words, does the argument flow cleanly from one point to the next, or would the argument benefit from rearrangement? If the argument would benefit from rearrangement, specifically explain how it might be improved. Sub-items:
	1. Identify a part of the paper where the logical flow/transition is **most effective**.
	2. Identify a part of the paper where the logical flow/transition is **least clear** to you. Offer a suggestion for how it might be improved.
	3. Does each paragraph contribute to the argument, or is there one or more sentence/paragraph/section that is disconnected from the central claim? If so, identify and explain.
6. Does the paper anticipate and address obvious counterarguments/alternative explanations? If yes, explain why. If no, identify the counterargument that the paper ought to consider.
7. Do you have any additional suggestions for how the paper could be improved? For example, have relevant terms been adequately defined, are there important limitations to the argument worth noting, does the introduction motivate the question and argument, are there additional resources from the course syllabus or otherwise that the paper could draw on to improve the argument?