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**Please fill this sheet out using complete sentences.**

**Does the author provide the necessary background in the introduction? Does the thesis have “they say/I say” format? What revisions can you suggest to make the introduction better?**

The author provides necessary background, using a “they say/I say” format. The introduction would benefit from more depth on the identity of the Op-Ed that is being responded to.

**Are the reasons clearly directing the paper or are the sources?**

It appears that the sources are guiding the paper more than the reasoning, especially given the overly long quotations and lack of paraphrasing/summary.

**Are there logical fallacies used in the paper? How can the author fix them?**

I cannot recognize any logical fallacies in the essay.

**What types of evidence are used? Expert opinions, statistics, court cases, academic studies? What could make the argument stronger?**

The evidence used is mainly *New York Times* articles, rather than studies. The use of studies would greatly solidify the arguments made.

**How are the intext citations? What needs to change?**

The in-text citations are fine, with the exception that they all seem to be direct quotations, even of other quotations, rather than summaries or paraphrases. The inclusion of paraphrases and/or summaries and the use of direct sources would greatly improve the feel of the essay.

**Are there valid concessions that the writer makes so that the essay is targeted toward a broader audience?**

There are not any obvious concessions the writer makes.

**Does the conclusion sufficiently conclude the essay?**

The conclusion sufficiently concludes the essay.

**What other revisions can you suggest?**

The main revision I suggest would be to go toward more scholarly sources, rather than NYT articles.