

Critical thinking on peer critique 1

[Health & Medicine](#), [Body](#)



The text I had for analysis was interesting and even captivating for me. It was so because of the way of presentation that was rightly chosen and the logical organization of the paper that I particularly enjoyed. Thesis was properly presented in the paper and throughout all the body paragraphs worthy arguments were given to support it. Below I will justify my opinion and present the ideas that I liked the most.

The author of the paper talks about the article called The Braindead Megaphone written by George Saunders. In particular, he states that Saunders aimed to persuade the readers that today's media is degrading, but failed to do it because of too much imagery and ironic illustrations. Another important point of critique of Saunders is that readers are left without the knowledge of what to do with the situation - they just have a set of information that in fact is already known to them. I think that the author of the paper presented thesis in such a manner that it is understandable to everyone and is persuasive. It is specific and provides a scope of analysis that is worthy of reading and thinking over. I think that the thesis can be improved by formulating it in one clear sentence in the introduction, because now although it is specific and clear, it is necessary to gather it by pieces. I enjoyed reading the author's analysis, because the quotations are used so that the main arguments are properly backed up and explained. The quotes receive the necessary amount of attention, interpretation being neither too long nor too short. I consider the analysis to be effective because of its logical order of presentation and the chosen arguments. With every paragraph reader of this paper understands that the ideas indicated in thesis are right. The overall essay structure is very good in my point of view with

clear distinction between introduction, body and conclusion and paragraphs organized in proper manner.