1. **Narrative Structure**:
    - **Introduction**: The website introduces its topic with a compelling headline that grabs attention. The introduction clearly outlines the goal of the website: understanding extinction risks across different animal species. There is a brief but effective explanation about how to interpret the graphs.
    - **Body**: The content focuses on different animal families, displaying data through interactive, scrollable graphs. Users can click on specific species for more detailed information, scroll through various groups, and use a search bar to explore by family or species.
    - **Conclusion**: There's no strong conclusion presented on the page. The story relies on users exploring the data themselves, leaving it open-ended.
2. **Visual Elements**:
    - The site uses **animated GIFs while scrolling** to maintain user engagement and focus. Graphs are the main visual elements, helping users grasp the extinction status of various species. The design is minimalistic, and the visual representations are clean, though there are some difficulties in interpreting the scale and meaning of the graphs due to the lack of direct percentages.
3. **User Interaction**:
    - Users can **scroll**, **click on species**, and **search** for specific families or animals. However, interactions are limited. There's a noticeable **lack of filtering options** and ordering mechanisms for risk levels, which makes navigation and comparison between species more challenging.

---

1. **Enhanced Understanding**:
   The short explanation of how to read the graphs is effective, helping users quickly get oriented. However, some aspects, such as the vertical axis not representing percentages but rather a count of species, can be misleading. More detailed explanations or legends might help improve understanding.
2. **Increased Engagement**:
   The animated elements and the ability to scroll through animal families keep users engaged, but there are limitations in terms of personalization. **Search filters** exist, but they are basic and lack depth. There's no information on why these animals are endangered or extinct, which reduces user engagement over time. More stories or images related to the animals could enhance the emotional connection and keep users interested.
3. **Improved Decision-Making**:
   While the narrative provides a basic understanding of extinction, it lacks context around **why** species are going extinct or at risk. This limits its ability to guide users toward informed decisions. Moreover, the lack of structure in presenting the extinction risks (no categorization by risk levels) adds to the difficulty in drawing insights directly from the data.
4. **Personalization**:
   Users can search for specific species or families, offering some degree of personalization. However, the search engine is somewhat limited, and the classification of genus can be confusing, requiring domain-specific knowledge to use effectively. Additionally, the lack of images or stories behind the species might lead to a loss of user interest over time.

5. **Narrative Structure**:
   The narrative structure is simple and minimalistic, which works for an introductory exploration of extinction risks. However, it lacks depth in explaining causes and potential solutions, which could be beneficial for users looking for actionable insights.
6. **Visual Elements**:
   The visuals are fitting but can be misleading due to the way the height of the graph bars is interpreted (based on how many species are in a family, not the percentage at risk). Adding more clarity to this would improve user understanding.
7. **User Interaction**:
   While there are some interactive elements (clicking, searching), the website lacks more advanced features like filtering by risk level or providing more detailed breakdowns of the data. The search engine could be improved to make interactions smoother and more meaningful.