1. Comment on the thesis statement:

Lauren Prather has written a clear thesis statement which does an effective job at explaining what the main focus of her paper is going to be. It is explicit and simple, but it could be more precise if she included some subpoints in her thesis.

1. Comment on the analysis:

Lauren’s analysis is very good and made use not just of Gordon Marino’s text, but also included Albert Camus’ text as well, thus using a blend of both works to follow through on her thesis statement. In her summary/exposition, she uses sufficient quotation of primary source material and manages to blend it in well. She demonstrates clear understanding of the material and provides sufficient detail in her writing.

1. Comment on the critique:

Lauren Prather had yet gotten to her critique, so I can’t describe what her critique is like or its effectiveness.

1. Comment on the conclusion:

Likewise, Lauren had not yet gotten to her conclusion, so there is nothing I can say in this regard.

1. Comment on format, spelling, and grammar:

Lauren Prather only suffers from some minor issues in her grammar, spelling, and style. She used “it’s” instead of “its” to indicate possession once, forgot to include the comma splice twice, forgot to separate independent clauses, and may be a bit verbose at times. These issues are minor and her writing is still clear.

1. Final comments:

I really liked it. I think that in terms of content and focus, she does a better job than me. Her writing comes off as significantly more inspired than mine is and is rather effective.