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1. Introduction

* I reworded the prose to make it flow better. While the intro had a decent framework, the details needed to be expanded upon. Additionally, the order and structure were redone so as to make the argument more coherent. Some of the extra details from other sources were cut so as to create a greater focus on the focus background paper.

2. Article Summary

* This section was combined with the theory section. The information seemed redundant to put in two different sections. Also the flow was better with one section going into much more precise detail. This way the logic for the theory could be backed up with the background information needed without separation.

3. Analysis

a. Conceptual clarity

* Some revisions were made on wording and made the point clearer. I added some examples and expanded upon the existing definitions. The organization was unclear so much of the text was discarded.

b. Theoretical coherence

* This section was kept short because I felt that some of the considerations were already made in the theory section.

c. Research design concerns or limitations

* I addressed some of the issues with the incoherence and the wrong questions being answered. The mistakes were a function of a lack of attention to detail, which was remedied through careful examination. I feel that this section is much more relevant to the questions being asked as well as more copacetic with the definitions discussed in class.

4. Suggested Extensions

* I expanded upon my main extension to make it more clear and to make it more theoretically interesting. Also added was my expectations for the values of the effect of the extension, and what each value would mean.
* I kept the Solow model proof because I felt that the data was obtainable, just from a different area of study perhaps. I feel that it is an easy and quick extension that has the potential to strengthen the argument.

5. Bibliography

* This section will be expanded on next semester as the data analysis is expanded upon. I felt that it was sufficient to discuss the research design by focusing on the main paper rather than trying to pull meaning on the main paper from other sources.