

Guidelines for Workshop #3
Comments on *Scientific American* Updates

Earlier this semester, I provided detailed guidelines for your comments on your partners' narrative essays and critical reviews. This time around, you can respond more directly to the distinctive issues that you see in each paper. At the same time, you should keep in mind the importance of providing both small-scale and large-scale feedback. The hardest task for an editor is to step back from the specifics and identify broad patterns. I have listed below some of the features that you should consider as you write up your comments for your workshop partners.

In this case, as with the narrative essay and the critical review, you should not focus on the syntax of individual sentences. I will continue to provide each writer with detailed comments on mechanics.

Be sure to consider the following features of each *Scientific American* update:

- The effectiveness of the introduction in fulfilling its many functions
- The continuity of the discussion and overall coherence of the article
- The internal logic and explicit divisions within the article
- Reference to and integration of material from multiple sources.
- The use of examples and evidence
- The liveliness of the article
- Appropriate tone and language for the intended audience
- The conclusion

Your completed comments for each of your partners should be **at least 500 words** long. If one or more of your partners has not posted an article for you to read, check with me to find out how you should proceed.

Follow the posting and printing guidelines of the two earlier assignments.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<https://ocw.mit.edu>

21W.034 Science Writing and New Media: Perspectives on Medicine and Public Health
Fall 2016

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <https://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.