

## General Comments

I thought the introduction was very well written overall and did a good job already including a lot of the ideas we had discussed in class. The sentences flowed nicely and usually met reader's expectations of the information that was needed. Most of my specific suggestions are about places where several ideas were combined into a single sentence and could perhaps be improved with multiple stress positions.

One important thing that's missing is clarification of what problem the paper will solve. There's a good setup of the general context but it's not clear what the rest of the paper will be about.

## Specific Comments

### Line 1

I think the opening sentence could be split to clarify the process. You could say "... investigations are carried out to determine whether the case involved child abused. One of the common signs of abuse is [AHT]".

### Line 3

I think this sentence could be rearranged to put AHT in the topic position - "AHT is defined by [the CDC] as [...]"

### Line 12

This sentence seems to contain a couple different ideas, which buries the key idea that alternatives to AHT would be accidents that parents aren't at fault for. This could be emphasized by splitting off the end into a new sentence, something like "... caused the child's trauma and ultimately death. The goal of the argument is to show that the death was accidental and the defendant was not liable."

### line 15

The reference to the Chadwick paper gives a number for the rate of short fall deaths, but there are no other numbers to put this quantity in context. As a reader I was left wondering whether this actually was a lot (which seems to be the implication from context).

### Line 18

This sentence immediately refers to two new papers. In the spirit of *old information to new information* Gopen promotes, you could maybe rearrange this to "Short fall deaths have also been studied by [...] and [...], but these papers do not provide..."

### Line 21

There's a lot going on in this sentence about Moran's paper, so it could probably be broken up. The description of bias as currently included seems like an aside, so you may think about whether it could simply be moved to later in the paper. There also three other ideas: improper calculation, bias, and the result that the incidence rate of short falls is underestimated. Since this result seems like the most important point, maybe it could be included in the stress position of a first sentence, with the reasoning given in the second sentence.

**Line 25**

This is a good paragraph but it seems somewhat out of place. It may be better to simply switch it with the previous paragraph so that there's first a block where we find out why Chadwick's paper is of interest then a block where we see criticisms.