Sample Critique #1:

I found both “Galactic Archeologist” and “Celebrating the Galactic Millennium” to be both¹ well written and informative, although I preferred the Astronomy piece.

The Astronomy piece² was written for a much wider audience and³ as a consequence, uses wonderfully visual phrases to call up an image⁴ of the phenomena in the article. Phrases such as “fire-cracker-like string of supernovae” and “resemble the path of a bee flying about randomly within a closed room” make this article easier for the general public to understand, and entertaining to read.

The article from Johns Hopkins was written for an audience that doesn’t require such flowery language to understand the main points. Even so, “Galactic Archeologist” could have benefited from a little more colorful wording,⁵ and a little less repetition. The article used six pages to say what could easily have been said in half the space.⁶

So, although both were well suited for their audience,⁷ and both were well-written, I’ll take the Astronomy piece any day (which is why I have a subscription).

Notes:
1. “Both” is used twice. The sentence would be more effective if “to be both” were deleted.
2. Repeats last three words of previous sentence; can be a tool for emphasis, but emphasis is not needed here.
3. There should be a comma after “and,” to bracket the parenthetical phrase “as a consequence.”
4. Disagreement of the singular “image” with the plural noun “phenomena.”
5. Comma not needed here; this is a string of two items “colorful wording” and “less repetition.”
6. Check your facts. The article is only about 3 pages long.
7. “Both” is plural and “audience” is singular. This would be okay, except that the critique argues that the articles are addressed to somewhat different audiences. Better wording would be “although each article was well suited to its respective intended audience…”