

1. While reading the paper, do not worry about grammar/spelling. Revisions are supposed to focus on ideas and crafting of the narrative into a cohesive story, as well as refining the approach the author takes with the argument and the supporting data. Editing grammar/spelling can be done by the author in a later draft.

2. Underline/use a highlighter to mark any sentences/passages you had to read more than once to understand what the writer was saying.

3a. after reading the paper, but without looking at the argument again, write out what YOU think the author is presenting as an argument.

3b. Look at the author's argument, and then in 1-2 paragraphs explain why narrative and the studies/data presented do, or do not, i) follow from the argument, and ii) support the argument

4a. outline the way the paper is constructed by drawing on paper a visual-map diagram/flowchart, or using bullet points (feel free to go back and look at the paper)

4b. in a different color pen, add your own suggestions on where within your outline there could be improvement in the a) the argument, b) the narrative, c) the data that are supposed to support the argument

4c. write 1-2 paragraphs addressing each of the a,b,c above

5. As a 'naive reader' what questions do you have about the details of the topic, or the scope of the data, that you do not feel were sufficiently addressed in the paper.