Paper 2 Peer Feedback

*Instructions:* Copy and paste the contents of this document on the top of the paper you received, then email it back to whoever sent it to you, and cc: it to [suast101projects@gmail.com](mailto:suast101projects@gmail.com). The subject of your email should be “Feedback on Paper 2 for <their name>”.

1. **Does the paper clearly narrate the basic history of the scenario they are writing about?** If not, what advice would you give them to improve the narration of the scenario they’re writing about? Would their paper be easier to follow if it were reorganized? If so, explain how.
2. **Is it clear from the paper whether the scenario involves a deliberate deception** (one where the claimant knows what they are saying is not true -- e.g. those claiming cigarettes are not unhealthy), **negligence**(one where the claimant really *ought* to know better, e.g. flat-earthers) **or innocent mistake?**
3. **Does the author clearly describe how the flawed process of science led to the propagation of a false claim?** (These “flaws” might be intentional, of course, if the claimant is trying to deceive others.)
4. **If pertinent, does the author talk about any “red flags” that a skeptical audience might pick up on?** If the scenario involves a claim presented to the public (e.g. that the earth is flat, that smoking is healthy, that the moon landing was faked, etc.), does the   
   author address how an audience might recognize that the claim is not well-founded?
5. **After reading the paper, what questions about the scenario do you have for the author?** Is there something else about the scenario that you are curious about that could be added, and that would contribute to the narrative?
6. **Were there any aspects of the author’s writing that you found particularly interesting, compelling, or educational?** What did you like the most about reading their work?
7. **Do you have any other suggestions for the author to improve their presentation?**