Peer review of critical lens essay

Writer's name	Ashley Ellison
Reviewer's name (optional):	G. Griffith

Questions	**Your comments**
Introduction: Introduce the target text and the specific themes or events that will be addressed in the analysis?	The writer introduces the target text and connects it to the lens text efficiently. The theme is presented in a way that makes sense and the intro sets the tone for the essay.
In your own words, what is the point of interaction? How does one text relate to the other?	The point of the interaction is that in "Constructing Normalcy", undesirable traits are rejected and not thought of as fully human. This connected to the target piece, *Squid Game,* where each contestant is seen as just a number, and they are used purely as entertainment for the wealthy.
Rewrite the thesis statement from the analysis	The views of undesirables being rejected in Lennard Davis' "Constructing Normalcy" is portrayed though the brutal treatment of the lower class in *Squid Game*, where the impoverished are seen as numbers due to the fact that they are not seen as "normal" or "human."
Can you suggest improvements to the introduction?	I would suggest rewriting the thesis to fit all the really good themes of the introduction. Everything is really strong, but the thesis statement itself is weaker and a bit confusing. What does it mean when you say **"…the idea of the contestants being just a number and desirable traits that benefited the contestants?"** Weren't there no desirable traits that benefitted the contestants greatly for the sole reason that they are just a number? Would it not benefit the upper class behind the whole game? I get that certain challenges required patience and precision, but I think it's smarter to stick with upper class vs. lower class than begin to introduce lower class vs. lower class. This thesis statement should be the one thing that ties the intro together, and I feel as if it does the opposite. The introduction is very solid and well done nonetheless.
Body: Is the lens text fully explored before the target text is applied or should there be more information about the lens text? What other information would you suggest?	The lens text is fully explored before the target text is applied, and it helps draw connections between both texts. I wouldn't really recommend adding any other information in this aspect because it was done really well.
Other than transitions, do all body paragraphs open with strong topic sentences that state the main idea and describe what will be discussed in the paragraph?	Yes, all body paragraphs open with strong topics that not only state the main idea, they present a very good analysis of the lens text to begin.

Do the body paragraphs maintain the focus indicated by the topic sentence?	Each body paragraph continues to maintain the focus indicated by the topic sentence.
Is all the information in the paper relevant to the analysis?	Yes, all the information in the paper is relevant to the analysis.
Are the sources cited heavily or does the writer not include enough citations from the lens and body text?	The lens text is cited beautifully, but there are no in-text citations for the target text. There are great references between both texts, but I feel as though the target text needs to be cited throughout.
Conclusion: Does the conclusion restate the information presented in the body and refer back to the thesis statement?	The conclusion does restate the information presented in the body and does refer back to the thesis statement.
How can the writer improve this analysis?	In terms of the conclusion, the writer can improve this analysis by adding more to it. There were so many great points made in the essay, and I feel as though not enough of these points were really addressed in the conclusion. The last sentence did not feel like a sentence used to conclude an essay, it looks like a point that can be made in a conclusion paragraph (plus, it begins with "And" which takes away from the sentence and the ability to be a concluding sentence).
In your opinion, which area needs the most work?	The area that needed the most work is the conclusion. For an essay that made beautiful connections, it truly needed a stronger ending.
What's the strongest section?	The strongest section is the body. Each point made from the lens text is nicely connected to the target text. The analysis made complete sense, and it was clear to see through the lens of normalcy projected onto *Squid Game*.
Language: Is the language easy to read or do you think it's too complicated?	The language of the text is easy to read. However, if possible, I think certain parts of the essay need to sound a bit more professional. Starting sentences with "But at the end of the day" or "And" is questionable. Furthermore, numerous sentences could be combined into one so that they seem less like filler material. Ex. ==In the game world, they were nothing but a number…==In the show, the representation of being solely a value is way more extreme than it is in reality, but it does shed light on the idea in a different manner. ==It is more drastic but it is clear==." ==Part 1== – This sentence is not needed because it just repeats what was already reiterated numerous times. ==Part 2== – Similarly, the previous sentence just stated that the representation is more extreme, so it does not need to be repeated.
Works Cited: Is there any source(s) listed in the "Works Cited" list that is not quoted directly in the writer's analysis?	Yes, the target text is not cited at all in the writer's analysis.