

Your name: Chloe Durand

[Hyperlink to the draft under review](#) (Chelsea York)

Audience

How effectively do you feel this draft convinces the reader to agree with the argument being made, on a scale of 1 to 10? Try to keep in mind the kind of reader the argument seems to be targeting.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
Totally Moderately Extremely
ineffective effective effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for audience: 4

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

I think your essay could really benefit about narrowing in on what type of groups this climate change will affect most. Right now you have a variation in groups from scientists to the general population but I think it would be extremely beneficial in narrowing down into one specific group for the purpose of the argument.

Your passion for this topic is evident but sometimes it's a little hard to understand what exactly you're trying to say. You don't really express that you are against the spraying of aerosols into the middle of the essay. You talk about geoengineering and what scientists are doing but it doesn't really become evident what your essay is about until you state your own opinion about the matter. I think it would be helpful to state your opinion write away so it would be clear what you are trying to convey.

Once you state your opinion, this would be when to narrow in a specific group that would have the most impact and then discuss how life would be altered for them. I think this will help you reach a bigger, more target audience and help you convey your overall message better and enable them to agree with you.

Another thing I would do would be maybe put some more statistics into your article that would clearly illustrate the impact of global warming and climate change and how geoengineering is hoping to ameliorate that.

Purpose

What kind of public argument do you think this is? Check **one** (and **only one**) of the argument types below:

- This argument establishes an original **pro position** on an issue of debate.
- This argument establishes an original **con position** on an issue of debate.
- This argument clarifies the **causes** for a problem that is being debated.
- This argument proposes a **solution** for a problem that is being debated.
- This argument positively **evaluates** a specific solution or policy under debate (and clearly identifies the idea I'm supporting).
- This argument openly **refutes** a specific solution or policy under debate (and clearly identifies the idea I'm refuting).

How effectively do you feel this draft achieves the purpose for the argument type you identified above, on a scale of 1 to 10? Refer back to the type descriptions in the instructions for Blog Post 10.7 if needed.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
Totally Moderately Extremely
ineffective effective effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for purpose: **3**

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

The purpose of your argument, like I stated previously, is somewhat lost because you don't really state an opinion until the middle of the essay. I think that's why it would be helpful to state your opinion right away so it becomes more clear. Right now the purpose of your argument is a little unclear because it originally looked like it was heading in one direction but then it changed. You jump from global warming to climate change to geoengineering to spraying of aerosols. I'm not saying these are important but something you could do would be to establish geoengineering as a sort of "umbrella" topic and then trickle down from there.

Beginning with geoengineering and stating your opinion in the first paragraph would greatly increase the effectiveness of your argument and your overall purpose. I think also something that is detracting from your purpose is the fact that you decided to write it in first person. I think the argument would be much more effective if you wrote it in third person - but that's just a personal opinion. Whenever something is written in third person it automatically earns this aura of credibility and professionalism, which I think your argument could benefit from.

I think the stance you took on this, which is the con position, is perfect for this type of argument. If anything, this is more of a formatting issue than an actual content issue. If you move around a couple things I think the overall purpose of your argument will become a lot clearer.

Argumentation

Refresh your memory about [the three different kinds of rhetorical strategies we read about for Project 2](#): Emotional appeals, Ethical or credibility-building appeals, and Logical or rational appeals.

How effectively do you feel this draft uses rhetoric to make its argument? This might mean balancing different kinds of appeals, doubling down on one category or something else. There's lots and lots of different ways authors can use these strategies... So, what do you think of how this draft made use of these three categories of appeals, on a scale of 1 to 10?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Totally
ineffective

Moderately
effective

Extremely
effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 12. If your overall peer review grade for this assignment exceeds 20, I'll apply the additional points towards recent missing and/or low-rated blog posts. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for argumentation: **6**

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

The two rhetorical strategies that you employ are appeal to emotion (Pathos) and appeal to logical reasoning or thinking (Logos). With any sensitive topic like global warming or climate change, I feel like these two strategies are the most dominant and they are clearly illustrated in your essay as well. For emotion, you almost use a scare tactic like strategy (not a bad thing) in order to shock the reader to be more intrigued. I like how you brought up that many chemicals sprayed into the air have led to an increase in Alzheimer's. Another good point that you bring up is the soil deposits. These two examples are especially important in appeal to emotion.

The other rhetorical strategy that you use, pathos, I feel like is almost attached to any scientific article. I mean, science is very logical so it's only natural that the thinking behind it in the reader is also logical. I liked the evidence you used of the volcano erupting, which I thought was really good because it put more in perspective. I think if you included another example like this it would be really helpful.

Genre

You will need to read/look at the hyperlinked examples in the student author's Blog Post 11.3 in order to rate this category.

How effectively do you feel this draft follows the genre conventions established by the examples they linked us to in Blog Post 11.3, on a scale of 1 to 10? Try to keep in mind that this is about how well this draft would fit - visually and tonally - on the specific website the student author is designing their argument for.

