Paper # 1

Kuhn and Popper: Finding a Synthesis in the Discord

Thesis

In the beginning of your thesis statement, you name three people "Wes Sharrock, Ruperd Read, and Pat Hutcheon" yet never say who these people are or even mention them later in the paper. If they are significant enough to be in your thesis statement, I would identify them, otherwise I would consider not using them. Secondly, "will be made" is the passive voice. To have a strong thesis, it would be wise to use strong, active verbs to make your point. When you refer to "their theories," I assumed you meant Kuhn and Popper, but that is always ambiguous with several other names mentioned in the sentence. Finally, a verb is needed in the last part of the sentence after the dash.

Strength of Arguments

Your arguments are for the most part strong. Some other issues that I will later discuss sometimes make it hard to see the strength of the arguments, but the assertions themselves are well thought out. One exception may be the argument about the height in structures; I think that you oversimplify a little bit here.

Logic/Speculative Arguments

Again, here, your logic is for the most part good and you logically reason in each individual paragraph. The structure argument again is logical, but is not completely analogous to the differences in opinions between Kuhn and Popper.

Flow

The flow of your paper may be the biggest thing you need to work on. The paragraphs seem to be written individually and randomly ordered in the paper. Transitions between paragraphs are lacking somewhat and this makes some of your good arguments to understand. I would strongly recommend revising the organization of the essay. I would think about how the order that the points are made affect how the message is received. In my opinion, it would be best to first

point out the perception of the differences between Popper and Kuhn. This is assumed because you say they debated each other, but it is not directly stated. Then, I would identify the main differences. Finally, then you can show how these differences are really not so different and then conclude.

Word Choice/Syntax

As I talked about in the thesis section, I would strive to eliminate use of the passive voice. Beyond that, there are several sentences in which confusing prose forces the reader to read two or three times before any meaning can be derived. I will identify specific examples below.

Paragraph #1

- See **Thesis** section.

Paragraph #2

- Eliminate "two representatives of distinct schools of scientific thought" (optional)

Paragraph #3

- Line 2: make "and" into "an"
- Line 2: insert "that" after the second "and"
- Line 3: insert "possible" after "how"
- Lines 3-5: revise sentence beginning with "both emphasize"
    - Consider inserting verbs after "Kuhn" and "Popper
    - Other revisions

Paragraph #4

- Lines 4-5: Sentence beginning with "Kuhn calls.." needs revision, awkward
- Line 6: delete "on the other hand"
- Line 9: insert comma after "subject"
- Line 10: replace "which" with "that," delete comma after "evidence"
- Line 11: "indistinguishable" is too strong, comparable or similar maybe?

Paragraph #5

- Awkward transition
- Line 4: "entire" to "entirely"

Paragraph #6

- Line 2-3: delete “goes from a plateau,” change rapid to rapidly, change advancement to “advances”
- Lines 4-8: very confusing with parentheses, consider alternatives
- Line 8: insert comma after “science”, insert “the word” after comma
- Line 9: delete “very”

Paragraph #7

- Third Sentence: compares scientific tests of Kuhn to “good theory” of Popper, not parallel comparison
- Last sentence is a run-on

Paragraph #8

- Instead of parentheses, use commas
- Replace “vain” with “vein”
- Line 9: who is “she”
- Line 16: “And its not like” informal, alter
- Line 18: delete “s” off scientists

Paragraph #9

- Line 9: insert “gives” after “, but”

Paragraph #10

- Change first sentence to “The 1965 debate between Popper and Kuhn was far more contentious than the difference between the two merited.”
- Second Line: for the most “part” not “point”
- Last sentence: replace “, which” with “that”

Good Luck!