

Draft comment scheme, paper #2

NOTE: If a paper is not posted by 5 p.m. on Monday, you do not have to comment on it.

Your comments are due, posted on WebCT, by 1 p.m. on Friday, March 12. (Note that this is a change from the earlier calendar.) Revisions will be due, posted to WebCT, by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23.

Name	Comment on		
Bradbury, Tiffany	Vuturo, Dina	and	Carter, Jennifer
Brady, Shannon	Wood, Jonathan	and	Cross, Daniel
Carter, Jennifer	Bradbury, Tiffany	and	Egri, Ari
Cross, Daniel	Brady, Shannon	and	Gregorio, Al
Egri, Ari	Carter, Jennifer	and	Jackman, Steven
Gregorio, Al	Cross, Daniel	and	Kantor, Marcie
Jackman, Steven	Egri, Ari	and	Lorenz, Stephanie
Kantor, Marcie	Gregorio, Al	and	Mitchell, Jen
Lorenz, Stephanie	Jackman, Steven	and	Petermann, Adam
Mitchell, Jen	Kantor, Marcie	and	Powers, Justin
Petermann, Adam	Lorenz, Stephanie	and	Tundo, Gene
Powers, Justin	Mitchell, Jen	and	Vuturo, Dina
Tundo, Gene	Petermann, Adam	and	Wood, Jonathan
Vuturo, Dina	Powers, Justin	and	Bradbury, Tiffany
Wood, Jonathan	Tundo, Gene	and	Brady, Shannon

Guidelines for response

Note: This response is intended not only to help the author but also to give you practice identifying *topics*, *issues*, and *discussions*.

1. Choose a substantial paragraph in the paper.
2. After reading the first one or two sentences, write down what you think the paragraph is going to be about (the *issue*, in Williams's terms). When you finish the paragraph, tell the author whether the first sentence or two adequately indicates what the paragraph is about—that is, is the *discussion* actually about the paragraph's *issue*?
3. Write down the topics of the sentences (keep in mind that *topic* is a technical term in William's schema). Is the topic string coherent? If not, how would you revise it?
4. Aside from the paragraph you just finished analyzing, what one thing is most important for the author to focus on when revising?
5. What do you like about the paper—what should the author *not* change?