

The Difference and Similarities Between Three Lab Reports About the Consumption and Carbon Dioxide Content in Dairy Products

Abigail L. Ureña

Department of English, The City College of New York

ENGL 21007: Writing for Engineering

The City College of New York

Ms. Crystal Rodwell

March 2, 2020

*when I printed this out the page numbers got messed up

Example: I noted 2 & 3 (its containing components of 6 examples, the author could thoroughly explained example."

have ince

-should I mention the content of the labs more?

YES!!!

- did I use enough support & evidence from the labs?

NO!

This is your primary problem. It is impossible to fully understand or agree w/ you w/o reading the original reports. include some explanation that doesn't force your reader back to the originals. don't use page #s but instead use the relevant content. write what (kind of) info could be removed or condensed.

ANALYSIS OF THREE LAB REPORTS ABOUT DAIRY PRODUCTS

2

Abstract

This page is not a good abstract of the reports your purpose is however, a good introduction

In this essay, I will provide a rhetorical analysis based on three different lab reports about the same topic. The topic of the lab reports I have chosen are the consumption and carbon dioxide content of dairy products. These lab reports use different methods and techniques to evaluate their data and results. The first lab report mentioned, *Functional food, uncertainty and consumer's choices: A lab experiment with enriched yogurts for lowering cholesterol*, this report will be referred to as lab 1 in this analysis. Lab 1 conducts an experiment to test the impact of

-> purpose for the analysis? Maybe the reason why we should do analysis?

reword better

valuable health information on the consumer's choice of yogurt. (This is a well written lab report that is written in the standard format, but contains an abundance of unnecessary information).

"that follows a standard lab format"

The second lab report mentioned is *Investigation of solubility of carbon dioxide in anhydrous milk fat by lab-scale manometric method*, this report will be referred to as lab 2 in this analysis. Lab 2 is about a study that addresses the solubility of carbon dioxide in anhydrous milk fat.

This is a very well written lab report with a very clear and concise introduction also written in the standard format. The third lab report mentioned, *Culture-independent bacterial community profiling of carbon dioxide treated raw milk*, this report will be referred to as lab 3 in this analysis. The third lab conducts an assortment of experiments to test the impact of the addition of carbon dioxide in raw milk to help increase shelf life. (Lab 3 is a strong lab report that contains an

repetitive format this another way

abundance of useful information, but can often detract the reader from the main purpose of the lab report, and it is written using the standard format.)

used the word already & not necessary

(i) aren't really necessary in the sentences where you mention the names of the lab reports.

① I disagree w/ one reviewer. This essay provides a rhet. anal. of three diff. l.r. about the consumption and c.d. content of dairy products. It's straight to the point. Direct is always better than wordy. Note - there is still some room for improvement.

Note: The parens () are used by a reviewer to highlight sentences. DON'T add them to your doc.

ANALYSIS OF THREE LAB REPORTS ABOUT DAIRY PRODUCTS

The Difference and Similarities Between Three Lab Reports About Dairy Products

Every lab report used in this analysis contains an Abstract and an Introduction section. In the first lab the Abstract section is ~~very~~ informative and states a lot of useful information to help the reader understand what the lab will be about. However, the introduction section is very cluttered and contains ~~much unnecessary information~~, the first paragraph of this section is quite misleading and should be removed because it mentions information that has no evidence to back it up. The third paragraph of the introduction section contains information that should have been included in the abstract, and here they should have mentioned the tests they were going to use for the lab. The introduction section contains a specific sub section called, cholesterol reduction and scientific uncertainty that contains a lot of extra information that isn't needed. If the authors wanted to include this section, they should have condensed it into one or two paragraphs. The same issue arises with the 13th paragraph of the sub section of the introduction section. The second lab report is the most concise and informative lab report of the selection. The abstract of this lab informs the reader of what the lab is about and what they would use to conduct the experiments. This introduction section by far the most excellently organized out of the collection of labs I choose. The third lab is a combination of the previous labs; the abstract section contains plenty of useful facts for the reader that will help them assess what the goal of the lab report is. However, the introduction section is similar to the first lab in that it contains a lot of not useful information. The first paragraph of the introduction section should be removed, and this section

should begin with the second paragraph, this will help keep all of the information much more organized and prevent it from being drawn-out excessively.

3
 maybe you should explain what an abstract is may not know what that is.

You need evidence or at least tell us what is extra & sh/b Condensed. I shouldn't need to read the original report to follow your analysis.

As annoying it may be to do, you need to reiterate what lab you are referring to in your sentences. when I read this, I feel lost trying to remember what lab report you are talking about.

In this paragraph, I think you should include more evidence to prove your ~~critics~~ critics, it looks like you just stated opinions.

~~evidence?~~
 Evidence?

Why here and not in the Methods section?

At all? or not needed in the intro more useful elsewhere? Hint: none elsewhere.

evidence?

Why?

Need details, what evidence what was needed, what was not used?

ANALYSIS OF THREE LAB REPORTS ABOUT DAIRY PRODUCTS
If you are going to do the analysis by sections, maybe you should put headings ✓

4 What about the first?

The second lab's materials and methods section is divided into many sub sections, these different sections allow this part of the lab to be very organized and easy to understand. The materials portion informs the reader of where the materials were sourced and how they were stored to achieve the most accurate results. The next section mentioned the apparatus used in the experiment, this topic covered the how the home made apparatus used in the experiment worked. The following sections repeated the same format; the section of experimental design is not necessary since all of these aspects are covered in the previous topics. The following sections follow the same pattern, they aren't completely necessary since they mention information that has been covered previously in the lab. The third lab is lacking in the materials and methods section; this section needs more details when describing the methods used, because this left the reader a bit uncertain, and the uncertainties were not covered later in the lab. Like the previous lab, the author's of Lab 3 included where they source their materials. Table 1, in lab 3, includes the details of the raw milk samples; this table is very beneficial in analyzing this lab. The method section in Lab 3 was well written, however, it just needs some improvements to help clarify

some details for the reader. Lab 1 had the best methods section out of the three labs, this section was divided into small paragraphs and graphs that provided a lot of information. The experimental design section, had a very useful and concise explanation of the control groups used and why they were used. The fifth, sixth, and seventh paragraph of this section explain the control groups that are being used in the lab with great detail, this helps the reader better grasp how this lab works. Figure 1 also provides a timeline of how the experiment was conducted, this

further helps the reader.

Please stop # -ing the H's. Discuss the content & format. H's suggest that your audience needs to go back to those docs and read.

Is this what makes a lab report good?

1st you say Lab 3 is lacking. then you provide evidence that is not lacking.

what improvements??

how?

ANALYSIS OF THREE LAB REPORTS ABOUT DAIRY PRODUCTS

5

~~have~~?

have

All three of the labs had faulty results sections. The three labs had long results sections that included an enormous amount of information that was not needed. If these sections would have included less information that was not needed, it would make the labs better overall. Out of all of the labs, Lab 2's results section was the most drawn out, and included information that was completely not necessary. The graphs used were ~~very~~ effective to help the reader analyze the data, since these graphs were included, the authors should have removed some of the paragraphs as they became very redundant. Lab 3, also had a ~~very~~ long results section, however, this section was much more concise and the information wasn't as redundant. Figure 1, of this section should be moved to the beginning of the results section as its placement would make more sense here. Sub sections 3.3 and 3.4 of this lab should have been a bit more summed up, however, they contained good information that pertained to the lab. The paragraphs under figure 4 are a great conclusion of the the long results section. The results section of Lab 1 is also very confusing and contains a substantial amount of data that was not needed. The first two paragraphs of this section provided the most useful information about the results of the experiment. The graphs also included much information and were helpful to the reader, if it would have been more concise it would have been much better.

I think it should be present tense when you are analyzing reports but past tense for describing the experiment. Yes! But the author must explain all graphs.

This makes no sense. No context. Sure it's relevant content.

informal

Compared to the results sections, all three of the labs had very well written conclusions. Lab 1's conclusion section was great, it summarized the entire lab in just three paragraphs and it also provided information about how the results of the lab are very beneficial to the consumers' health. Labs 2 and 3 had far shorter conclusions yet they both were well written summations of the entire lab report. Lab 3's conclusion contained the perfect amount of information, and it even included a supplementary link in which more extensive data about the lab could be found. The

NO 'VERY' It is a child's adjective. Use a better noun and you don't need it.