**MA Exam Option 3 - Review of Two Scholarly Papers**

**Reader Report Form**

**Overview:** This review form is for faculty who have been asked to review a scholarly paper for a graduate student completing MA Exam Option 3: Faculty Review of Two Scholarly Papers. This MA Exam Option is intended for PhD students, and it is designed to mimic the anonymous peer-review publication process. The exam requires students to complete two scholarly papers of article length, one in the history of philosophy and one in a contemporary field. The first can be completed in either area. It must be completed before the start of Year 2 (including any required revisions). The second paper must be in the area not written on in the first paper. It be completed by the start of Year 3 (including any required revisions). Please see section 5.3 of the Philosophy Graduate Handbook for further details about how the exam is conducted. PhD students should also see section 6.4 for a detailed timetable for completing the exams as well as policies on extensions.

**Instructions for Faculty Reviewers**: Faculty reviewers should provide feedback similar to the feedback they would give in an anonymous reader report of a scholarly article. Please note that while these papers may eventually become conference papers or publications, students are not required to publish or present them in order to pass the MA Exam. Additionally, while this exam should mimic the anonymous review process, it is not anonymous. Student will not know which reader report is associated with which faculty reviewer (we will not include your name on the reader report), but students will eventually learn who the reviewers were when they receive the signed ballot for the MA exam.

In your review, please include the following:

1. Title of the paper
2. Brief summary of the main claims of the paper (100–200 words)
3. Recommendation of pass, revise and resubmit, or fail (see section 5.2 of the Philosophy Graduate Handbook for additional information about these recommendations)
4. Justification for this recommendation (500–1000 words)
5. A list of any minor issues that warrant further attention

**Faculty reviewers are encouraged to assess the paper according to the following criteria:**

**Argument:**

1. Is the main claim of the paper clear and well-articulated?
2. Is the scope of the argument manageable?
3. Is the argument convincing?
4. Is the argument coherent and well-organized?
5. Does the author offer compelling responses to objections that might be raised against this argument?

**Primary Sources:**

1. Does the paper offer a thorough and accurate exposition of the primary sources it is addressing?
2. Is the analysis of the primary texts buttressed by relevant and authoritative scholarship?
3. Does the author present the primary texts in a way that contributes to the overall argument of the paper?

**Contribution and Originality:**

1. Is the scholarly contribution of the paper clear and well-articulated?
2. Does the paper make an original claim that advances current debate in the field?

**Secondary Literature:**

1. Does the paper offer a thorough and accurate assessment of the most relevant scholarship on the topic of the paper?
2. Does the argument respond to this scholarship, add to it, or otherwise advance the secondary literature?

**Style:**

1. Is the paper well written, correctly cited, and properly formatted?
2. Has the paper been carefully proof-read for minor writing errors?