

Dear Grader(s):

Thank you for taking the time to consider my paper. I hope this letter will help you do your job by pointing out and explaining some strengths and weaknesses; places that I have changed, places I have not changed, and why. To that end, I will organize my comments by section:

"Background"

- Editors found that I made some small grammatical and stylistic mistakes here, such as using acronyms without defining what they stood for and using an incorrect citation format. I simply fixed them and then scanned through for anything else that might stand out as wrong or awkward.
- It was suggested that I change the statement dealing with pregnant women, because "men would be concerned about their future children". While this is true, men don't need to worry about what they eat for this reason and I don't want to imply that men control what their future children's mother eats. I re-worded it to make a societal comment, though, to get that general point across.

"Arguments"

- Same as background regarding grammatical and stylistic errors.
- In this section, I also originally had units taken from a paper without explaining what the units stood for. This was especially shortsighted because the units used were not standard units of measure. I added a discussion of the authors' methods and units.
- I also fixed the first paragraph of the mercury contaminants section, to clarify my sources and explain more fully where and how mercury contamination occurs.

"Critical Analysis"

- Same as previous two sections regarding grammatical and stylistic errors.
- A group member recommended adding examples or ideas of what could be done to remedy a few of the problems presented, which I did. This helped me put more of my own opinion/analysis in the paper.
- More than one group member was left wondering how farms could reduce contaminants in salmon. While this is a really important question, if it could be answered farms would

(continued on next page)

probably be doing it. I did more research and added more information about this general area, but I was simply unable to find a clear answer.

“Recommendations”

- Same as previous three sections regarding grammatical and stylistic errors.
- I also added a paragraph on how I came to my conclusions and recommendations, and changed a few recommendations a bit to reflect more of my own insight. It may have seemed like I took all of them directly from my sources because of all my citations, but there was a certain amount of my own critical analysis involved as well. They are overall recommendations that are well-grounded in the research that I did.

“Works Cited”

- My citations were not in the format preferred for this class, so I made sure they matched up to the format given.

Overall

- Some frustrating aspects of my paper that may weaken my arguments were that I often couldn't find research on specific topics that I wanted to include, such as how to reduce the contaminant levels in food—what I now know is sort of an inherent problem with raising carnivorous fish.
- When this project began, I didn't know anything about salmon aquaculture except that there was a difference between salmon marked “farmed” vs. “wild” in the supermarket. I learned a lot, and tried to present what I saw as the most important points, issues, and arguments in my February draft. Since then, my group has worked together a lot in order to prepare our presentation and poster. Through that process, I've learned even more about where my topic fits in to the larger picture of salmon aquaculture that my groupmembers researched. In my final draft, I've tried to bring in that broader sense in my own recommendations and critical analysis. Although I've added some information and analysis, I still think my paper's strengths are in its readability and explanation of complex concepts in relatively simple language.