

---

## Peer Review Worksheet for Argumentative Writing

Editor (your name and student ID number):

Author (partner's name and student ID number) :

Research Paper Title:

### Quick check:

1. Has the writer completed the generative AI use statement as required by the end of Week 16's class?  
*Yes, he has.*
2. How many pages long is the paper? Does it have a cover page and a References page?  
*4 pages long, excluding the cover page and references page. It has a reference page and, after a cover.*
3. How many paragraphs does the paper have? Does it include an introduction, a body with a few supporting paragraphs and one refutation paragraph, and a conclusion?  
*6 paragraphs. Yes, it does.*

### Introduction:

1. Locate these items:
  - **Hook (optional):** Put brackets [] around it and mark *Hook* in the left margin
  - **Background information:** Put brackets [] around it and mark *Background* in the left margin
  - **A clear thesis statement:** underline it
  - **Transitional words and phrases:** circle them
  - **Preview/roadmap** to indicate the reasons to support the thesis
2. Comments
  - Does the introduction provide sufficient background information so unfamiliar readers can still follow the argument? If not, what else could be shared?  
*Yes, he showed the important role of gene editing in clinical field, ~~but~~ however, ~~with~~ it is concerned with ethical problems. But he forgot to mention the safety problem of gene editing, which is important in his thesis statement.*
  - Does the introduction contain a clearly stated thesis statement (an arguable statement that the writing will prove)? If not, suggest how the thesis statement could be rewritten.  
*I think he should delete the "actively carry out research on genetic engineering" because it is not specifically demonstrated in the body paragraphs.*
  - Does the introduction include a roadmap that provides the reader with an outline of the argument to follow?  
*Yes, he showed two angles of "ethics" and "safety" for legislation.*

## Body Paragraphs

### 1. Locate these items

- Topic sentences of the body paragraphs (excluding the counter-argument / refutation paragraph): underline them
- The author's main reasons supporting the claim: summarize them below
  - ① Legislation should be made from the perspective of concern over the genetic privacy
  - ② Legislation should be made from the perspective of social equality.
  - ③ Legislation should be made from the perspective of handling methods.
- Transitional words and phrases: circle them

### 2. Comments

- Does each topic sentence directly relate to and support the thesis? Make suggestions for improvement.  
I think the three topic sentences only focus on one aspect of the argument, that is, the safety aspect, without carrying out the ethical argument.
- Does each body paragraph have a separate reason that supports the thesis? If not, which ones are the same? What are other reasons that could be used in a new body paragraph?  
Yes, each paragraph has a separate reason.  
Other reasons: Influence the definition of the relationship between parents and children.
- Does each body paragraph have supporting details that explain or give clear examples for the reason? If not, what are some examples or supporting details the writer could add?  
The examples in the first two body paragraphs are appropriate, but I think the example in the third body paragraph does not fit the topic sentence.  
Doctor He's irrational use of gene editing is one example that can be used.
- Does the order of the body paragraphs make sense? How could the writer rearrange the paragraphs so they are in a more logical order?  
I think the second body paragraph should swap places with the first.  
The order of argument goes from social to family to individual influence.
- Does the writer use complex transitions between paragraphs? If there are basic transitions (e.g. first; second; third), what are examples of transitional phrases or sentences that could be used instead?  
"Firstly" can be replaced with "First and foremost"
- Does the writer use transitions within each body paragraph to connect the examples/supporting details to the reason? If not, what transitions can the writer use to do so? Mark them on the research paper.

Yes, there are appropriate transitions within each paragraph.

### Counter-argument / Refutation Paragraph

#### 1. Locate these items

- Counter-argument: underline it
- Refutation: put brackets [ ] around it and mark *Refutation* in the left margin
- Transitional words and phrases: circle them

#### 2. Comments

- Does the writer examine a counter-argument? Is the argument actually against the thesis?  
If not, what could be a possible counter-argument?  
I think the counter-argument he uses doesn't exactly match the thesis. The article argues that gene editing should be legislated, so the counter-argument should be that it should not be legislated, not that it should not be developed.
- If the writer does have a counter-argument, does the writer actually respond to the counter-argument, or does the writer just give another supporting reason for the thesis?  
What could the writer say to improve the response to counter-argument?  
The direction of improvement should be to provide some professional support for legislation or the harm of non-legislation to counter the view that legislation is not needed.
- Does the writer provide enough supporting details, examples, or evidence in the counter-argument paragraph to show that the counter-argument is weak, and therefore, reinforces the thesis?

The current example is not convincing enough, it would be nice to have some more concrete examples (such as data).

### Concluding Paragraph

#### 1. Locate these items

- Restated thesis: underline it
- Summary of main points: put brackets [] around it and mark *Summary* in the left margin
- Final remarks: put brackets [] around it and mark *Remarks* in the left margin
- Transitional words and phrases: circle them

#### 2. Comments

- Does the conclusion refer back to the thesis statement?  
Yes.
- Does the conclusion use an effective closing strategy (e.g. making a prediction, calling to action etc.)? How could the writer change the conclusion to convince the reader?

Yes, the ~~para~~ conclusion uses the strategy of calling to action.

### Language Use

#### 1. Locate these items

### Mechanics/Format

1. Check mechanics, including:
  - whether the title is centered and capitalized correctly;
  - whether the first line of each paragraph is indented with 5 spaces;
  - whether double space is used throughout the entire manuscript;
  - whether the font is Times New Roman, 12 point;
  - and (use a different colored pen) circle any problems mentioned above.
2. Comments
  - Does the research paper follow the required formatting style? If not, what are other problems you find? Please explain.

There is no title "References" on the references page.

### Resource use

1. Locate these items
  - Circle each source referred to in the research paper. Locate each of these sources on the Reference page
  - Are there at least four references cited in APA style in the text and listed in the "References" section?  
Yes, there are.
  - How many direct quotations and paraphrases are used respectively?  
1 direct quotation and 5 paraphrases.
  - Is there at least one in-text citation used per body paragraph?  
Yes, each body paragraph has at least one in-text citation.
2. Comments
  - Do the in-text citations and references follow APA format? If not, please underline the parts that need revising and write a brief summary of the problems (e.g. In-text citations: no page number is added in a quotation.)  
Yes, they do.

### Overall Comment

1. Overall, what is good about the writing?

The language of this article is very standardized, there is basically no colloquial expression. The structure is rigorous and standard. The writer searched for a wealth of references and quoted them in the article in a reasonable way, which enhanced the credibility of the article.

2. What needs more work?

The logic between the thesis, body paragraphs and conclusion is not rigorous enough. Both the thesis statement and conclusion mention ethical issues as the basis for legislation, but there is no details in body paragraphs. The ~~map~~ road map in the first paragraph is not clear enough. The logic of the counter-argument does not match the whole article, should be expanded from the point of view of refusing legislation rather than refusing the development of gene editing.