

Priorities for the Critical Review

1. How effective is the current introduction? Does it engage your interest? Does it establish a clear direction for the ensuing discussion? Any suggestions for the author?
2. Does the writer make clear why his or her subject matters?
3. What is the main idea (central insight) of the critical review? Where do you see that idea stated most clearly?
4. Does the writer provide sufficient background information about the subject of the documentaries? Does that information appear in the most useful location within the critical review?
5. Did you learn enough about the documentaries to enable you to follow the writer's analysis?
6. Does the writer make effective use of one or more of the scholarly articles on science documentaries? If not, can you suggest a possible role for one of the articles?
7. How well does the writer handle evidence from the video and the journal articles? Is there enough supporting evidence within each paragraph? If not, point out weak spots.
8. Can you follow the logic that leads from one paragraph to the next? Identify any gaps—places where you have difficulty following the logic.
9. How effective is the writer's conclusion? What changes or additions might you suggest?
10. Reconsider the introduction in the light of the conclusion. Does the introduction point the reader in the right direction? Would you suggest any additions to the introduction?

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>.