Writers: Customize the following suggestions for peer comments, deleting instructions for feedback you don’t require and adding questions of your own. When you have finished, copy and paste your instructions into the end of your essay draft.

Reviewers: Read though the essay twice, once to get an overview of the argument, organization, development, and style and again to make comments. As you read the essay the second time, comment on the following features:

1) Identify the writer's thesis. Comment on whether the thesis presents a clear, defendable argument regarding how aspects of mise-en-scene, cinematography, or editing contribute to the scene’s significance.

2) Identify the main argument of each paragraph. Does the paragraph effectively develop the thesis? Why or why not?

3) Compare the promises of the thesis paragraph to the content of the essay. Does the essay raise issues not clarified in the thesis paragraph? If so, comment on how the thesis paragraph does not provide an adequate introduction to these issues. Does the thesis paragraph raise issues not addressed in the essay? If so, note the unaddressed points and explain how the essay doesn't adequately develop these points.

4) Comment on at least one of the writer's strengths. Explain why you think the author has done something effectively (for example, made a strong argument, used evidence from the scene well, made a logical connection between two ideas, etc.).

5) Comment on places where the writer could develop the argument. Pose questions that you think will help the writer explore the scene or its formal elements more fully. If you’re not convinced by the writer’s claims, explain why the argument isn’t convincing to you.

6) Comment on places where descriptions of formal techniques are used well and where they are used ineffectively. Explain why the writer's use of evidence is more or less effective in these places. Is there a balance between description of visuals or editing and analysis?

7) Choose a paragraph to critique in terms of style and grammar. Note sentences or phrases you find awkward, unclear, or “flat.” Does the writer need to reorder sentences? Rewrite them? Combine them? Vary their structure? Does the writer need to use stronger transitions between points? Do you see a particular pattern of grammatical errors in this paragraph?

8) Overall, which area(s) does the writer need to focus on in his or her revision? In your comment, explain why the writer needs to concentrate on this area.

    • Thesis (addresses the topic, presents an argument focused on the function of the formal elements in a specific scene)?
• **Organization** (argument proceeds in a logically ordered manner; each point connects to the preceding and following points)?

• **Development** (each element of the paper advances the thesis)?

• **Evidence** (reference to the scene supports specific claims; evidence is well selected and analyzed; essay uses an effective balance of quotation, summary, descriptions of technique, and analysis)?

• **Complexity** (essay demonstrates a thoughtful analysis of the scene and an understanding of the issues discussed in the lecture and writing link)?

9) How can the writer best address the areas in which he or she needs to revise? Were there points made in lecture the writer needs to consider? Are there specific questions the writer needs to answer in his or her revision? Should the writer reread chapters from Bordwell and Thompson? Are there aspects of editing, cinematography, or mise-en-scene that the writer hasn't considered, but that would add to his or her argument?