Peer Critique of a Literary Essay

Editor ________________________ of ______________________’s Essay

First allow the author to read aloud his or her paper to your group. Follow along carefully with your copy of the essay, marking any areas where you are confused or you see a problem. Do not discuss the essay until you have had time to listen to the essay and to respond to the following questions.

1. **The Introduction:**
   A. Is the title compelling? What suggestions can you offer for improvement?

   B. Does the intro. earn your attention? Are the works and their authors clearly identified? Can you underline the thesis? In short, do you clearly know what the author’s topic is and what he/she is going to explore? Does the author clearly define terms such as “hero” or “arête”? Offer suggestions for improvement.

2. **Body Paragraphs:**
   A. Identify paragraphs that you feel nicely develop one main claim of the argument. Does the paragraph give sufficient **textual support**? Does the paragraph fully **analyze or explain** the significance of the text and how it sheds light on the thesis? (Check for the “sandwich” approach to quotes.) Star (*) paragraph(s) you feel are the strongest.

   B. Identify the paragraphs that you feel lack a clear topic sentence, textual evidence, or analysis/explanation. Mark paragraphs(s) with an X. What would you suggest the author do to improve the paragraph(s)?

3. **Grammar/Punctuation/Style:**
   A. Does the writer need to work on grammar, and if so, what aspects? (for example, run-on sentences, comma splices, fragments, etc.—see Writing at C-N). Give one example from the paper.

   B. Does the writer need to work on punctuation? (for example, commas, possessive case apostrophes, etc.—see pp. 30-34 of Writing at C-N). Give one specific example from the paper.

   C. Has the writer stayed in the present tense for works of literature?
   D. Are titles of works given properly? See Writing at C-N.

4. **Conclusion:** Does the conclusion offer you a final insight or suggest a course of action rather than merely repeat what has already been explored?

5. Is the **Works Cited** page complete? (See Writing at C-N.) Is **internal documentation** correct? (See Writing at C-N and the sample paper on the library web page under WAC: www.library.cn.edu.)
