A completely different person proofread the seconds

Inconsistencies throughout the paper → grammarly?

Dropped headings for methodology

Intro:

* First 3 sentences are directly copied and pasted into the abstract
* Literally just a literary review
* Spends a lot of time on space servicing but never again anywhere else
  + Try to cut it down if it’s not part of the project
* **No research questions**
* It’s clear what you’re trying to do, but state it
* Ends without saying what’s in your paper later on
* SIGNPOSTING

Gear train not useful since robotic arms and 3D printers use direct drive

Stiffness of materials for arm

3D axis printer limitations

* Wording
* Don’t discuss other types of printing
* Curing?
* Talk about SLA!

Figures:

* 1.1 is after 1.2 and 1.3
* 1.2 and 1.3 have separate citations → screenshotted?
* You’re not allowed to screenshot others
  + Either make your own or ask if you could use them
* Some are equations, not figures

Font size

* ~~Changes throughout twice~~ It doesn’t

Arm

* Don’t discuss stiffness of arm

Topic Sentences should be more specific

Timeline:

* Vague
* Use a chart rather than a list

Budget:

* Don’t put google searches
* Be specific
* $700-$4,000 too large of a range

Applications

* Put into abstract?

Formatting

* Table of Contents would be useful
* Acronyms
* Define when first mention
* Cut down on wording
* Try to give a brief overview of how the technology works, not everyone knows what to do
* Well organized but the writing has varying degrees of proficiency
  + Not unified
* 3-D vs 3-d vs 3d vs 3D
* No parentheses ...oops
* Longer does not mean better
* No back ups for some statements
* Never defined “in-situ”

We believe that this is the best way to do such and such

More absolutes