Your name: Chloe Durand
Hyperlink to the draft under review (Samantha Macklin-Isquierdo)

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 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 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:

You write well but there really isn't much of an argument in this essay, which doesn't really prompt the reader to take a side or form their own opinion about human genome editing. You were nearing an opinion about whether it is ethical or not, but then just kind of gave a run down of facts that were pertinent but didn't really support any given argument.

I think two things that could help you improve would be for one, state an actual opinion about the matter. Do you agree or disagree with human genome editing? I think this is a topic where you either side with an organization or group of people about their stated opinion or you write in the first person and give YOUR opinion.

The second thing that would help would be to make it a little more relatable. You touch up a little bit on the positive effects of human genome editing - like working towards a cure for

cystic fibrosis and HIV - but then don't really say anything else. Instead, you spend a majority of the time talking about how little it costs. But then you don't really mention what any other alternatives are. I think you should either pick to focus on how it will help cure diseases OR how little it costs in comparison to other methods.

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.
____X___ 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 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 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:

This reads more like an evaluative argument but I think it would be much more successful as a pro or con argument. There really isn't much of a purpose here besides a run down of facts that don't really have any meaning because there is no overall opinion. I think the facts you chose are good but they could be better if you took a specific stance on the issue.

I think something that could really help when you are editing your essay is to answer "so what? why is this important?" You want the reader to be incentivized to take one side or make a change. You even said it yourself, "Most importantly and apparent, is the power to change humankind and lessen the impact of diseases and illnesses globally." So if you are in support of human genome editing, you need to understand the opposing side's arguments and deconstruct them in a thoughtful way that will increase support for your own side.

Another thing would maybe include images that are a little more relevant or take them out. I think maybe one big picture and then a couple block quotes could be much more effective.

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: **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:

The only rhetorical strategy that is really present here is logos, which is logical reasoning but only because you touched upon how human genome editing is much more cost effective than other ways.

I think to improve upon this essay you could really make use of the rhetorical strategy of pathos, which is appeal to emotion. I think a lot of people don't really understand what exactly human genome editing really means and what it can do for the future of humanity or diseases and I think you need to illustrate that emotion in your article. I think at the end of the day people value their family, friends, and loved ones - how would genome editing impact them? How could it make a difference in their lives?

I don't really think you yourself need to establish yourself as extremely credible as long as you present concrete evidence and research that shows the benefits of human genome editing. You could hyperlink to these sources in your article so people have opportunities to learn more about the topic. You already do this a little bit by discussing Eleonore Pauwels but I think you should include more.

I would mostly focus on the rhetorical strategy of pathos.

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.

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 genre: **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:

After reading a couple of your examples I understood that you were mirroring it more off a scientific news website. I think this is the right genre to go with because you will be able to cover more in a more professional manner in order to convey your argument.

However, I think your essay is generally lacking in visuals and purpose. I liked how in the examples you included they had a myriad of relevant pictures and graphs which really helped understand the topic more (after all, not everyone is an expert in DNA and RNA splicing). I think if you want to reach a wider audience you will have to break it down more for people. You do a great job of this when you said:

"The CRISPR-cas9 technology works by targeting a gene, sending an enzyme to slice that gene's DNA sequence, and either changing the sequence or replacing the DNA. To target a specific gene, RNA is used due to its DNA recognition method. This is a permanent form of genome modification, and is the best technology of its kind. It is also the least expensive and least time-consuming, which in turn opens the science up to more researchers globally."

I think here would be a good moment to include a metaphor that would make it a little easier to understand the topic and put it more in perspective.

You stated that a purpose of your genre was to stay informed, which is exactly what you do when you give them the facts surrounding human genome slicing. However, in order to really enrich your reader's minds, I think it would be really beneficial to provide a stated opinion and more evidence for one side than the other. I also noticed how some of the examples you included focus on one exact part of genome editing - like what kind of rules should there be? I also think that's something else you could do in order to refine your essay and make an argument more apparent.

Other comments?

Good first draft, you have concrete evidence just need to form an opinion and argument in order to relate all that information together.