For the first analysis, my primary criticism is the source noting. It would be far easier to read the paper if the author had used numbered subscripts that directed the reader to the works cited page. As it is, I found myself continuously reading through long source names. It was not a lethal issue, but it was annoying. The pacing of the paper was rather flat throughout, with no one point being held higher than the others. This made reading it seem a bit bland, despite the very interesting topic. I can in no way relate to the author, as I have a deep love of all arachnids, but that didn’t keep me from enjoying the overall topic of the analysis. I didn’t note any grammar or spelling mistakes, but the diction in some parts felt a bit off. Nothing horrid though.

As for the second example, I found it more interesting than the first, and a better causal analysis to boot. This is mostly because of the sheer amount of evidence given, and the dedication it must have taken to gather all the information. Unlike the first example, the topic was of a single event, not an overall concept (though that could be argued). This means that a good chunk of the research done was about the personal lives and accounts of people, which can be more difficult to find than fact-based topics, such as a psychological phenomenon. I also loved that the author didn’t show their opinion on the topic until close to the end, letting no personal bias leak through throughout the paper. My main criticism is that the author’s description of some of the studies was rather vague and missing important points to understand exactly what was going on. There were also several grammatical and spelling mistakes that were slightly distracting.
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