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1. In a scientific talk or poster, there are generally 4 main categories to touch on. These include an introduction, methods, results, and discussion. The main purpose of an introduction is to give some background on the topic at hand, as well as introduce the knowns and unknowns of the experiment. This will lead to stating the question and hypothesis of the study in the introduction as well. The methods section functions as a description of the experimental study so that in the future, the study could be replicated by a different researcher in the field. The results function as a quantitative summary of the effect of the treatment on the response. This often includes data visualization such as graphs or charts. The results usually also have a goal in mind. Lastly, the discussion section functions as an interpretation of the results found in the study. In this section, researchers often refer back to their question and hypothesis and amend their knowns and unknowns now that the study is complete.
2. “DNA Sequencing: SNP1, SNP2, SNPB and SNPBH: Determining Genotype”

“Identifying the Correlation of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms in Determining Genotype”

“Determining the Genotypes of Four SNPs of Two Individuals”

“Genotype of Photic Sneeze Reflex”

1. For the poster titled “DNA Sequencing: SNP1, SNP2, SNPB and SNPBH: Determining Genotype,” I think their framework was very clear and each section was appropriately labeled. I also think for each section, they properly fulfilled the function and purpose of the given section. For example, as an introduction, they gave background and clearly stated what the research question and hypothesis were. The only critique I had was that they could have interpreted their results a little further because I am still a little confused about why those results are the way they are and why.

The poster titles “Identifying the Correlation of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms in Determining Genotype,” the researchers also did a good job of communicating their study using the framework above. They included almost all the same sections, except the introduction was labelled as “background” and “specific aim.” I think the framework of this poster helped the audience follow the entire study and understand what was going on in an organized fashion.

1. To compare the poster titled “DNA Sequencing: SNP1, SNP2, SNPB and SNPBH: Determining Genotype” to my work in project 1 and 2, I think a common strength we had was the ability to effectively display the results in a way that is easy for the audience to understand. A common weakness we had was that throughout the poster presentation and throughout my slide deck for project 1, it was a little hard to follow the entire process due to the quick changing from section to section and because not all audience members are an expert in the field, making these types of presentations hard to follow the entire time.

When looking at a common strength between the presentation “Identifying the Correlation of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms in Determining Genotype” and my projects in BIOL 120, I think we both effectively used and referred to data visualization such as a graph in order to better display the effect that the treatment in our experiment had on the response variable. A common weakness we had was that the results weren’t interpreted as well in the discussion and we both could have restated information from our introductions and amended it in order to show how our results answered and created a new hypothesis.