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Feature Article: Peer Review

**1. Structure:**

* List the sections of the article. For each section, list the key points.
* Which section is most compelling? Why? What about the structure do you find effective?
* If there are any paragraphs that aren't clear mark them in the margins. If there is anything about the structure that doesn't make sense, describe it.
* What would add to the clarity of the structure on a paragraph or essay level?

**2. Content**

* What question does this article pose?
* Read through the feature article again to identify the following information:
  + Hook
  + Description of the controversy
  + History of the controversy
  + Explanation of the phenomenon/science/etc
  + Controversial aspects of the issue and positions taken (look for 3)
  + Position on the controversy (this is not required, but look for it.)
  + Solutions, future research, new questions
* Does the article provide a sophisticated answer to the question?
* Which sections successfully transmit content?
* Which section is most successful in transmitting content? Where is information missing? Where is information described in too much detail? Where is information confusing?
* How would you fix it?

**3. Style:**

* Read through the article a third time to identify the following components:
  + Personal anecdote (first person)
  + Personal anecdote (third person)
  + Researcher profile
  + Historical narrative
* Which section do you find most stylistically compelling? Why?
* Is the style inconsistent in any of these sections? Why?
* What would you recommend to fix these inconsistencies?