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Project Overview

This draft of FRIENDSHIP takes some effective steps forward, in particular when it comes to Richard's characterisation. Making him a more consistent presence creates this great parallel between he and Aziz as these two faulty father figures with far more in common than their ideological differences allow them to realise. The second half of the narrative, too, ties the various strands of the narrative together more effectively. However, there are some issues that persist. The script does still hit it's 'point' a little too aggressively at points, and in the early part of the story this ends up hampering some important set-up. More importantly, there still isn't quite that clear sense of cause-and-effect throughout the narrative. It's definitely more cohesive, but
there's work to do to connect some of the story's biggest beats together more cleanly.

Notes

As above, the most significant shift from the earlier draft here is Richard's meatier role in the story, and this marks the drafts biggest improvement. What was already great about the script was the way it spared no-one's perspective its criticism, the way Jacob's naïve POV allowed us to see the flaws and prejudices in the ways the other characters interacted. This is very much still the case, and in fact fleshing out Richard's role in the story has pushed this even further. The father-son relationship both he and Aziz have with Jacob creates a clever parallel between the two that plays beautifully into the narrative's core themes of prejudice. The script achieves this by echoing or contrasting aspects of each character in the other. We can see that Richard wants to be involved in Jacob's science project on p.40/41, something Jacob denies him, while Aziz is initially reluctant to get involved with Jacob at all, but is soon drawn in by his enthusiasm p.37/38. Both men's prejudice manifests in trying to shape the perspectives of the young, with Richard trying to limit Jacob's contact with Aziz (p.21/22) and Aziz trying to draw Majd away from his particular branch of Islam (p.39). Both men are driven to violence by their own certainty, with Aziz's religious beliefs driving him to an attempted act of terrorism on p.49/50, and Richard's certainty of his involvement leading him to attack Aziz (p.60), threaten him (p.73) and later attempt to frame him (p.89/90). Both are overtly connected to the idea of an absent father, too, Aziz given the death of his and Richard given his inability to be there for his son.

This is really neatly constructed in and of itself, but it's in two key decisions that the script really makes this parallel shine. The first is the disparity between Jacob's interactions with the two men and the cold, hard facts of the story. On paper, Aziz's actions are far worse than Richard's. The mistake he makes (attempting to kill) is far worse than Richard's (not being there for his son). But through Jacob's innocent eyes we get to examine the importance of someone's ability to change. As the narrative progresses, even in the wake of the attack, Jacob continues to get closer to Aziz, something that reaches an emotional head around p.85 when he's reluctant to let his own father join him at the science competition for fear he might lash out at Aziz. Given the script's use of dramatic irony - the audience knows that Aziz was involved in the attack at the midpoint of the film - it would be easy for the story to continue to build tension out of the idea that Jacob is in close proximity to a would-be murderer, out of the fact that this child doesn't understand who he's dealing
with. Instead, Jacob’s assessments are actually *borne out*. Aziz continually demonstrates that, beneath his awful mistake, he’s a good person, something Jacob is able to see from the very start, and in particular during the scene on p.69 in which he comforts Aziz. Jacob, on the other hand, continues to lose his grasp on his relationship with his son, going against his own advice (p.85), getting more angry and violent, and lying to his son about being nice to Aziz.

This is really cleverly done. Taken at face value, we would expect to view Aziz more negatively than Richard, but through Jacob’s eyes, through the way he reacts to them, we’re able to realise that 1) these two men are really quite similar but that 2) one of them has the capacity to realise and address their own hatred while the other does not. This all builds to the second brilliant decision, the way the script pays off this parallel come p.114 by having Aziz explain the danger of hatred to Richard, finally allying them in their goal to see some justice for Jacob. While it’s worth noting that this scene is perhaps a little abrupt in its execution – given there’s been a bubbling tension between these two since Richard first heard about Aziz, it feels like the script could milk a little more out of this climactic meeting – it’s nonetheless a great way of tying off the core theme, cementing the comparison the script has subtly drawn throughout.

So, a well executed development for the story, but where the script still has further to go is in tying its key story beats together into a cleaner narrative. It’s worth approaching the story chronologically in order to break this down...

**Act 1: Start → Jacob’s first ‘sale’ outside SpiceLand p.34**

The first thing worth noting here is that we don’t quite have a clear initial impetus for the story. In retrospect, we can of course point to Aziz’s arrival on p.12 as our inciting incident, and we have another point of change in the arrival of Majd as early as p.3. But, because we’re allied to Jacob's POV at this early stage, we can only view the arrival of these characters in that context, and it’s worth noting that, in that context, neither introduction feels like its kicking the story proper into gear. Majd facilitates a fight that, given it ends up involving a jab or two at Richard, feels like it could very well have happened without him, while Aziz obviously remains pretty distant and cold to our other main characters for a little while, plus we don’t start switching to his POV until p.24. What we really need, then, is for these introductions to more immediately feed into the core conflict facing Jacob, and that means making *that* conflict as punchy and impactful as possible.

The problem we face currently is that, when we’re introduced to Jacob, Richard and Estelle in our first scene, we’re seeing the continuation of existing
tensions rather than a dramatic step up. We can infer from Richard’s exchange with Jacob p.2/3 that the marital problems have been going on for a while, as has his frequent absence from home due to work. As such, it doesn’t feel like all that much is changing for Jacob in the early part of the story, particularly given we’re trying to use Richard’s absence as a catalyst. We’re left questioning why it’s only now that he’s lashing out at school, for example, or now that he’s seeking paternal validation elsewhere.

The easy way around this is to push the opening towards something more drastic. Let’s say, for example, the opening scene instead saw the breakdown of Richard and Estelle’s relationship, the moment Richard is forced (or decides) to leave, and concluded with him trying to assure Jacob that they’ll still see each other as often as he can make it work... Now we’d have immediate impetus for the story. Jacob’s life has just changed drastically and for the worse, so when Danny takes a jab at Richard a few pages later during their clash over Majd, we can really feel why this is such a sore point for Jacob. And, when Aziz arrives soon after, we can immediately read Jacob’s interest in him as him filling the whole left by a now more detached Richard. Of course, this is just one way to play it, but the point is it feels like we need that clear, simple escalation in Jacob’s situation that we can use to add weight to the introduction of characters like Majd and Aziz.

The next hurdle worth identifying in this early section of the story ties back to something touched on in the prior report: the script’s approach to its message. It’s worth noting first that this draft is a notable improvement, with characters noticeably less beholden to their slant on the core idea of prejudice – losing the speeches at the close of the narrative, for example, feels like a good move. However, there are still moments in which the script is perhaps a little too trigger happy in its approach. A good early example of this is Danny’s responses to Majd across p.4-7, which can’t help but feel a little too immediately racially aggressive. It’s easy to let ‘bully’ characters slide into cruel mouthpieces for whatever insecurity the narrative wants to examine to the extent that they become only that, and we’re erring a little too close to that here. This wouldn’t necessarily be a problem on its own – it’s not like Danny is a prominent character, and it’s absolutely important to the story that Majd experience this kind of prejudice – if it weren’t for the fact that going this hard this soon doesn’t give this part of the narrative anywhere to escalate to. In that scene across p.4-7, we have Danny being immediately and openly racist to Majd to the point of violence (p.5), leading into a brawl between he and Jacob. This means that when we then get to p.25/26 and p.27-29 with the challenge and the football match, it feels like a step down in tension, rather than a dramatic development. We go from all-out racially-fuelled violence to a few
racial slurs and a promise that Danny will beat them at the science competition. Structurally, we want tensions to rise as we approach the close of our first act, but here we have the reverse because we go so hard so quickly.

We can see a similar, though less pronounced, issue with Richard. He immediately latches onto Aziz's background as the issue when he hears about him on p.15, and is taken to task about his prejudice by Estelle on p.21/22. If the idea is to build Richard's resentment of Aziz because Richard harbours a little insecurity about another male figure spending time with his son, then this feels like playing our 'prejudice' hand a little too early. Again, we aren't leaving enough space to escalate because Richard's immediate response is prejudicial fear and suspicion. On p.15, he's resistant to the idea of Jacob spending time with or near Aziz because he might be dangerous, and he remains in that place (albeit getting a little more forceful e.g. p.36/37) until the terrorist attack at the midpoint galvanises his aggression.

These are, really, examples of the core issue, the fact that the narrative doesn't quite feel like a cause-and-effect, developing story yet because of the way these beats are arranged. Let's take Jacob's side of the story as an example. To create the sense of rising tension across the first act, we could rearrange what's there into something like:

-We open with, to use the above example, Richard and Estelle arguing, followed by an upset Richard telling Jacob he's not going to be around as often. Jacob's life has just changed significantly.

-At school, he's a little dejected. We introduce Majd, which in turn establishes Danny as a bully. He makes some digs at Majd, taunts him for being the new kid, but perhaps we're only flirting with prejudice at this point. Maybe Jacob, as now, defends Majd and Danny takes a few jabs at Richard, but it doesn't yet escalate to violence. This might be a good time to bring in something like the line that's currently on p.29, the idea that the science competition is a way to beat Danny.

-We introduce Aziz, as now. He's initially cold and distant.

-Jacob struggles with Richard's absence. Richard lets him down once or twice (e.g. p.22).

-This then feeds into a bigger confrontation with Danny. Perhaps, as now, they have a football match, but it's here that the confrontation escalates to violence. Danny, frustrated at losing, gets openly racist and aggressive towards Majd (and Sameeha if she's there), and takes a few more swipes at
Jacob’s dad. Jacob’s increased frustration comes out in a violent outburst. He attacks Danny, hurts him, and perhaps Danny’s expensive ball is a casualty of this fight, too. Positioning this sequence here makes it the climax of the first act, which feels stronger than hitting this early and then de-escalating.

-This could lead really nicely into the scene in which Aziz finally helps Jacob with the science project (currently p.36/37). Jacob has just been reprimanded by his teachers, his mother, the father he now barely sees. Aziz sees he’s dejected and decides to help. Now, the relationship between the two is more overtly influenced by Jacob’s struggle. Dad leaves → Jacob gets frustrated → Jacob gets into trouble → Jacob finds comfort in a new father figure.

It’s just an example, but it seeks to illustrate that we can re-order and shift what’s already there to create a clearer sense of narrative progression. We could do much the same with Richard. If his resistance to Aziz starts out as a pure kind of ‘Who is this guy who’s going to be around my son?’ response, but then escalates to prejudice as Jacob talks more and more about him, we’d have a clearer sense of rising tension. We’d have further for Richard to develop. It’s important for the narrative’s theme, too. Given how nuanced and effective the script is at deconstructing the mindset behind prejudice, it’s a shame that the way that prejudice manifests, at least on the Islamophobic end, is a little uniform. With Danny, Richard, and the thugs on p.50/51, we have characters who immediately and openly jump on people’s background, and letting Richard’s prejudice bubble beneath the surface a little more could help add variety. It’s the difference between the overt racism in something like CRASH and the subtler, less self-aware racism in something like GET OUT (‘I would’ve voted for Obama for a third term...’). Both exist, of course, but if we want to build a complex picture of prejudice, we don’t want all our Islamophobic characters to be quite as clear-cut as they are. Richard is, of course, already more nuanced than Danny or the thugs, but there’s scope to push this further.

Act 2: Jacob’s first sale → Saif’s Return p.94

As above, the massive improvement here is in keeping Richard more intimately involved with the story. His quest to prove Aziz’s guilt after the terror attack gels beautifully with Aziz’s own reform after meeting Imam Malik on p.66 and later Nooriyah on p.79. There’s a really clever dramatic inversion here. In the immediate aftermath of the attack, we’re driven to root for Richard, despite his prejudice, given the dramatic irony that we know Aziz was involved. But the script wisely chooses this section of the narrative to give us real insight into Aziz as a character via a moment like, for example, p.60/61, when we discover his history. So, as Richard grows more dogged in
his desire to expose Aziz, our desire for him to succeed diminishes. This creates constant tension, at least in that part of the story. By the time Richard is talking to Dev about Aziz on p.76/77, we want Aziz to get away with. We want him to be allowed to continue on this redemptive path. This is nicely constructed.

The attack itself, too, is brilliantly staged. The quick-cutting between Aziz and Jacob’s perspectives creates a real sense of urgency, and keeps that dramatic irony potent. We know what’s coming, and worse, we know how close Jacob is to the danger. It’s also a really effective step-up in the father/son tension between Jacob and Richard. We might expect going through something like this to, if anything, bring them together, but the script takes a more interesting approach by using it to re-contextualise the things Jacob innocently observed in the first half, the wires in Aziz’s bag, the red-haired man handing him a note. It forces a a kind of ultimatum to the arm’s-length conflict between the Jacob/Aziz relationship and the Jacob/Richard one as Richard tries to push Jacob into ‘giving up’ his new friend. This is great, couching the attack specifically in the way it exacerbates an existing character conflict.

If there’s a key thing to note about this mid-section, it’s that, as above, there’s scope to tie some of the disparate elements of the story together a little more. Aziz’s de-radicalisation via Malik and Nooriyah is good, but it’s odd that we don’t wring more out of the tangible fallout of the attack itself. We know there were casualties – we learn as much on p.56 – but this isn’t something we ever really see Aziz grapple with. He was so close to being a part of this. He even presses his detonator on p.50. Given that, it feels like there’s scope for him to grapple more with the potential consequences of his actions after the fact. Does he visit the ‘scene of the crime’ and see the aftermath first hand, the flowers, the scorched ground, the grieving relatives?

And what about Jacob? His relationship with Jacob is such a crucial part of the story, and even before the attack, we’ve seen something of a bond form between them. So, how might the realisation that Jacob was at the scene of the attack, that he could have been a casualty of it, going to affect Aziz? Might there be a scene in which Jacob is relaying his experience of that day to Aziz, scared and confused, while Aziz is forced to struggle with the knowledge that he was one of the instigators? Currently, Aziz’s character shift comes largely through other characters showing him that he may have misinterpreted the Qur’an. While it’s great that we’re challenging the foundation of his beliefs even within his own religious community, it also feels like we’re sightly isolating him from the most emotive and dramatic part of what he’s done: the fallout of the attack itself. This is an important point because the attack is such
a step up in the dramatic stakes of the story. We need to ride that wave, but currently we take something of a step down as we move into the second half, as Aziz goes back to helping Jacob with the project, their relationship seemingly unchanged (bar Richard being more aggressively against it), and finds time for quiet contemplation with Malik and Nooriyah.

And with Richard’s side of the story, it feels like there are a few developments here that don’t fully pay off. His meeting with Dev on p.76/77, for example, plays like he’s asking for a violent solution to Aziz’s freedom, which marks a dramatic step up for the story. But this never really goes anywhere. Dev comes back on p.93/94 to bail him out, but, as the exchange tells us, nothing has actually been done. This leaves this part of the subplot feeling a little inconsequential. It hasn’t changed anything. We could say the same about Richard’s attempt to frame Aziz at the science competition. It’s a great sequence, the way Richard acts as though he’s patched things up while surreptitiously trying to seal Aziz’s fate, but again it doesn’t end up causing anything. He gets arrested and Dev gets him out. If we were to completely remove both these plot points, the meeting with Dev and Richard’s attempted framing, the rest of the story would play out almost exactly the same. All it really does is exacerbate the tension between Richard and Jacob, something that has already been in play in light of p.60/61 and p.73. Again, this ties back to the core hurdle facing the script, that lack of clear cause-and-effect.

To be clear, having Richard doggedly pursue Aziz is great – it just needs to prove more consequential to the rest of the story. Let’s say, for example, Richard’s stunt at the science competition caused a stir that saw Aziz questioned by police. We could then use that as the impetus for bringing Saif and Karim back into the story. Seeing some heat around him makes them worried he’ll talk, so they bring him in with the intent of pushing him into martyrising himself (as they already do p.97/98). We could even tie this into the attack that takes Jacob’s life – perhaps the pressure Richard is inadvertently putting on them by snooping around and trying to establish Aziz’s guilt forces the other terrorists to bring forward their next attack, to improvise something now for fear they’re on the verge of capture. Again, it’s about connected the disparate beats of the story. Currently, the third act is kicked into gear by Saif’s return, an event that doesn’t feel like the direct result or escalation of anything that has come before. The story feels a little disconnected as a result.

**Act 3: Saif’s return → End**

A lot of great stuff here. Aziz escaping his martyrdom for a second time by tricking Abdul p.99/100 works brilliantly, and the script really maintains this
tension by running this straight into his panicked call to Nooriyah, his realisation that Jacob is the next target... And Jacob’s death on p.104 is, of course, a really powerful moment. The way the script reconciles Richard and Aziz’s conflict on p.113/114, too, brings the two sides of the narrative together really neatly. That said, as above, there’s scope to milk a little more out of it. Bearing in mind how consistent their conflict has been (since p.15), this is a big moment, and seeing them unite in the worst of circumstances is something worth playing out.

Given how pacy and tense this section is, beyond ensuring that it builds a little more clearly on what comes before (as above), the other areas worth addressing are far more minor. For one, it’s worth noting that we haven’t seen Jacob and Majd sell cakes from their wagon since way back in act one, so it perhaps feels a little convenient that they’re suddenly doing it again on p.101, ready for the attack. Is the idea that they’ve been continuing to do this each week since the first? That would more clearly explain why the terrorists have decided to use them to carry out the attack: it’s a routine they can rely on. Currently, however, though Jacob mentions doing it each week on p.34 and p.35, it isn’t something we really bear out, especially given Majd leaves the picture after p.40. It’s worth clarifying.

The final thing worth noting is the ending. As above, losing the speeches and going with something more simple and visual is a great move. That said, it does feel a little odd that we end on a group of our secondary characters. As important as Estelle and Vivian are in providing extra perspectives on our core theme throughout (Estelle’s unwavering tolerance and Vivian’s altruism shaken after the attack), they aren’t the characters in whom the script has invested us. Those are Jacob, Aziz and Richard, the characters with agency who drive the story. The ‘conclusions’ we get on p.116/117 are, therefore, in a sense more fitting endings, though might need altering a little if we want them to close the story in a satisfying way.

This involves thinking about what the script’s core message truly is, and the current ending suggests it’s about our ability to overcome the most violent consequences of prejudice and still come together. It’s worth trying to find a way of doing this through our more prominent characters. The shared look between Aziz and Richard on p.117 is nice, for example. Could we build this more overtly into the sense, however faint, that there’s a mutual respect between them now? Or perhaps we could bring back an image from earlier in the narrative, say the pencil Aziz snapped and sharpened back on p.37, and have him playing with it as he’s driven away... The script’s sort of going for this already with the cut to Jacob and his friends playing football on p.119,
it feels a little detached because we're suddenly viewing things from another perspective – Estelle’s – that we haven’t really been allied to across the story so far.

Conclusion

So, a definite step forward from the previous draft, particularly in bolstering Richard's role and creating a third complex figure at the centre of an already nuanced story. The key moving forward is finding ways to causally connect the events of the narrative. With each key beat we need to ask ourselves how it tangibly follows on from the events leading up to it, how it’s going to escalate the core conflicts in play, how it’s going to change the course of the story from here. As the above seeks to show, the good news is that a lot of this can be achieved by simply reworking and rearranging some of the ideas that are already in play.

Your Project’s Statistical Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE AREA</th>
<th>RATING /100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.H Premise</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Market Potential</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Originality</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity of Genre Positioning</td>
<td>70/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marketing Capability</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Structure</td>
<td>50/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scene Flow</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sequence Flow</td>
<td>50/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Originality of Structure</td>
<td>50/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cliché avoidance</td>
<td>50/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pace</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Character</td>
<td>70/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Distinctiveness from one another</td>
<td>70/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Originality</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Empathy generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Casting potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Setting/Milieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Visual Ambition/Flair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Originality of setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cinematic moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Match for the genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Authenticity/Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Succinct, says a lot with a little?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Character Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Originality of themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sophistication of theme exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Clarity of theme exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Relevance/topicality of themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>OVERALL % AVERAGE:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put your score in context, here at Industrial Scripts we rate some of the following scripts as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE SOCIAL NETWORK</td>
<td>88/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7EN</td>
<td>93/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE TERMINATOR</td>
<td>90/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE GODFATHER PART II</td>
<td>96/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THELMA &amp; LOUISE</td>
<td>87/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About Your Script Consultant: YFZ**
Your analyst is an experienced pro script consultant and editor who has assessed material extensively for Industrial Scripts, and is also a screenwriter with several projects under option.

**Useful Resources**

There’s already a plethora of information online about screenwriting, so we thought we’d cut to the chase in this section and describe the best link for the scenario you might find yourself in.

- What you need if you’re **struggling to see the wood from the trees** and want to get back to the essentials of screenwriting – the really important stuff: our [ULTIMATE Screenwriting Online Course](#) (free with FFN).

- What you need if you’re **looking for inspiration**: our list of [31 screenwriting books](#) you might enjoy.

- If you just need a good ol’ pick me up! Our article on “[10 Great Tales of Screenwriting Determination](#)” will get you there!

**Glossary of Script Development Terms**

**Overall Rating**

Note: we give our script consultants great leeway in terms of the verdict they deliver. Their decision is based on myriad factors, and no one score in any column is decisive.

- **PASS** – the script is not ready to be shown to agents, managers or the industry yet and to do so would be foolhardy. Upwards of 80% of the scripts we receive are Passes. Many scripts have, through a thorough development process with us, improved their rating significantly and been upgraded to Considers and Recommends. Whilst a Pass is by no means the death knell for a project, it’s important not to shy away from the script’s shortcomings, at least at this stage.
• **LOW CONSIDER** – the script *might* be ready to be shown to the industry, but it could be risky. In this case the script displays significant promise, but is letting itself down in a few key areas. Plenty to build on for the next draft.

• **CONSIDER** – this is a strong script, which is likely to provoke a favourable reaction from the industry, without blowing anyone away. The script has a number of strong attributes, but isn’t “taste-proof” yet. Many will like it, a smaller number will have a lukewarm reaction.

• **RECOMMEND** – this script is pretty much good to go, or very close to being so. Scripts at the higher end of Recommend will be essentially taste-proof: even if the project itself isn’t for that agent or that executive or that producer, they can’t fail to be impressed by it, and good things will entail when they tell their friends about it. Less than 1% of script we assess receive a Recommend verdict.

### Statistical Performance Explanations

• **MARKET POTENTIAL** – How well does the script fit into the marketplace? Is it in a genre likely to attract an audience? Do the concept and characters have demographic appeal?

• **ORIGINALITY** – Does the script stand apart?

• **CLARITY OF GENRE POSITIONING** – How well does the script fit into its intended genre? Does it manage to uphold the necessary conventions and tone? Is it clearly marketable as a certain ‘type’ of story?

• **MARKET CAPABILITY** – How well is the script likely to perform once in the marketplace?

• **SCENE FLOW** – How effectively are scenes constructed? Does each beat serve to lead us to a clear point of resolution? Or does the scene feel drawn out and aimless?

• **SEQUENCE FLOW** – How effective is the script’s act structure? Is there a sense of cause and effect from scene to scene?

• **ORIGINALITY OF STRUCTURE** – How cleverly is the script constructed? Does the structure serve a clear purpose to the story or the perspective from which it’s told?

• **CLICHÉ AVOIDANCE** – Does the script avoid well-worn story beats or lines of dialogue? If it’s a genre piece, does it manage to fit into that genre without falling back on tired tropes?

• **PACE** – The flow of the overall story. Do action scenes as written convey a sense of speed or urgency? Do slower sections work effectively to build tension, or do they drag? Does the speed and flow of the narrative fit with the premise/story itself?
• **CHARACTER DISTINCTIVENESS** – Are the characters sufficiently different from one another? Do they have clear, separate motivations, voices, mannerisms and so on? Or do they all sound like the writer?

• **CHARACTER ORIGINALITY** – Is this character just an archetype (grizzled male action hero; ruthless businesswoman), or are they a unique, nuanced creation?

• **EMPATHY GENERATED** – The extent to which we can invest in the core characters, their motivations and their struggles.

• **CASTING POTENTIAL** –

• **VISUAL AMBITION/FLAIR** – Does the script display a keen understanding of the visual medium? Is information conveyed to the audience in a visually arresting way? Does that style feel integrated or gimmicky?

• **ORIGINALITY OF SETTING** – Does the setting feel fresh for the genre? Are we avoiding log cabins in horror films and eerily empty spacecraft in sci-fi?

• **CINEMATIC MOMENTS** – Does the story facilitate impressive moments of spectacle? Clever set-pieces? Well-staged reveals?

• **MATCH FOR THE GENRE** – How well does the setting suit the core premise of the piece? Is it a natural fit?

• **DIALOGUE AUTHENTICITY** – Does the dialogue sound believable? Or is it too obviously a vessel through which to convey story information?

• **SUCCINCTNESS** – Fairly self-explanatory. Is the dialogue concise? Does it avoid clunky, drawn-out exposition or pontification and clearly articulate the intended dramatic/character point?

• **DIALOGUE DISTINCTIVENESS** – Do the characters have a clear voice, as distinct from the work of other writers? Within the script itself, is dialogue sufficiently varied to reflect shifts in emotion or the voices of distinct characters?

• **ORIGINALITY OF THEMES** – Does the script’s core message/theme feel like something that hasn’t been fully explored before? Or are we reiterating that ‘if you believe in yourself you can accomplish anything’?

• **SOPHISTICATION OF THEME EXPLORATION** – Does the script have something complex to say about its core theme?

• **CLARITY OF THEME EXPLORATION** – How clearly is the script’s central theme conveyed? Is it clearly represented in each character and the broader course of events?

• **RELEVANCE/TOPICALITY OF THEME** – Does the central theme or message of the piece draw on something that will resonate today? Does it have something important to say about the world we live in?
Thank You!

Thank you sincerely for allowing us to read and critique your project. Please bear in mind that the comments and opinions in this script coverage are not intended to be the final say on the potential of the script or its writer.

*Everything in the world of script development is subjective.*

Yes, an impartial, truly trained eye who assesses screenplays 24/7 has written this report but ultimately the comments herein remain one human being’s *opinion*.

As a Hollywood screenwriter we know put it: “a script note is only as good as you think it is”.

For more info on Talent Connector, our suite of online courses, Character-Driven (our blog) or any of the other products and services we offer just visit the link below:

[https://industrialscripts.com](https://industrialscripts.com)