

Miguel Diaz
BIOL 120
Dr. Fortino
4/23/2020

Research Day Reflection

1. For a scientific talk (or poster) describe, in general, the function of the:
 - Introduction: The purpose of the introduction in a scientific talk/poster is to provide background information and any knowledge that the audience should know in order to better understand the topic of the talk/poster.
 - Methods: The purpose of the methods in a scientific talk/poster is to show how an experiment was conducted and to share any other steps in the research/experimental process
 - Results: The purpose of the results section is to share the results/outcomes of the experiment of a scientific talk/poster
 - Discussion: The purpose of the discussion section is to analyze the results and determine whether or not the hypothesis was supported. The purpose of the discussion section is also to discuss any limitations/pitfalls of the experiment and to consider points of future study.
2. List the titles of the 2 research talks and (at least) 2 posters you viewed in the digital version of the Spring Showcase (https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/spring_showcase/2020/) .
 - BIOL 250: The Presence of Different Genotypes in Different Strands of DNA
 - BIOL 250: SNP rs2741762 Gel Electrophoresis, PCR Purification, and Sequencing
 - BIOL 250: Determining the Genotype of Four SNPs of Two Individuals
 - BIOL 250: Identifying the Correlation of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms in Determining Genotype
3. For one of the talks and one of the posters you attended, critique the authors' effectiveness at communicating their study using the framework you describe in the above question.

For the talk “The Presence of Different Genotypes in Different Strands of DNA”, the authors did provide sufficient background information in the Introduction section but I think that the context of the experiment could have been made more clear. Their methods section was highly detailed and clearly outlined the several steps of the experiment. The authors provided several tables and graphs in the Results section that clearly showed the results of their experiment. In their Discussion section, the authors communicated effectively as they clearly

state that their hypothesis was not supported and they also discuss the limitations of their experiment and points of further study.

For the poster “SNP rs2741762 Gel Electrophoresis, PCR Purification, and Sequencing, the authors did provide sufficient background information in the Introduction section but I think that more explanation should have been provided about the information in the Introduction. The steps of the experiment are outlined in the Methods section of the poster but more detail needs to be given in order for other scientists to replicate the experiment. Several figures and data tables are provided in the Results section that clearly demonstrate the results of the experiment. I think that the tables and figures could be better organized to make the findings of the experiment more clear. The Discussion section clearly discusses whether the author’s hypothesis was supported or not and it also discusses the limitations of the experiment. However, points of further study were not discussed in the Discussion section.

4. For each talk or poster you critique, describe instances where you showed similar strengths and weaknesses in your own work on projects 1 & 2.

A strength that I showed in my own work that was similar to the talk that I critiqued was that I provided a highly detailed methods section and I also provided tables and graphs in my projects that helped my audience visualize my data. A weakness that I showed in my own work that was similar to the talk that I critiqued was that I didn’t not provide sufficient explanation about the information that I presented in my Introduction section. A weakness that I had in my projects similar to the poster that I critiqued was that I could have provided more explanation about the information that I discussed in my Introduction sections of my projects and I also could have better organized my figures and tables in my Results sections. A strength that I had in my projects similar to the poster that I critiqued was that clearly stated all of the steps of my experiment in my Methods section.