

Peer review of summary analysis section

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Peer review of summary/analysis section

Review of First Summary It is evident that there you made an effort to consciously include different views, including your own, which makes the paper objective. I saw that there was balance when you quoted the writer's view as a "far stretch" but you still recognized the main points of the article. It was good that when you quote there is an explanation which expounds on why that certain quote is included. Your last paragraph was to contrast the first reading from the second, here I found that this made the task of summarizing the two articles easier since they are in different paragraphs. I think that from the first paragraph you could have already used the introduction into how stating how each reading relates and the last sentence could have been used as a better transition into the next paragraph instead of just ending by citing the title and thesis of Puente's article.

Review of Second Summary

I think the flow of the summary is very good. It's easy to read and you were able to fully illustrate the significance of the articles by citing the main points of each article. There was a clear thought on how they are all related and this was presented chronologically starting with Lunsford, Puente, Crystal and then Humphrys. In a very short summary all the articles were somehow mentioned and included. But I think the introductory sentence could have first stated the common theme of the articles instead of diving head on to the first article. I also think it wouldn't have hurt to include a conclusion and inserting a few of your own viewpoint like a concluding sentence.