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This analysis provides feedback on two of the strengths and weaknesses found in the paper written by Taylor et al. (2020) and recommendations that could be considered by their team to tackle the problems.

In terms of strengths, as offered in the thesis statement, the body paragraphs are formed in chronological order. In establishing the first main point, for example, the authors ensured that the views expressed in the first two paragraphs of the body were explicitly related to the first main point referred to in the thesis statement. As a consequence of that, writing is rational. In order to show the beginning and development of each focal point the team often used transitional words such as “In addition” and “Moreover” and this enabled the reader to concentrate on the writing.

One weakness identified is that the introduction is ineffective; it didn’t provide more back ground on the topic of the paper. The paper also uses some broad terms that could not be understood by a general audience. The words ‘uroepithelial cell receptors’ used in the paper, for example, make the point that the utilization of cranberry supplements minimize the reoccurrence of urinary tract infections caused by E.coli. But that doesn’t clarify what the uroepithelial cell receptors are.

The team should update the introduction based on the weaknesses. Members should consider writing more informative and clarifying the broader terms specifically relevant to the utilization of cranberry supplements to minimize the reoccurrence of urinary tract infections caused by E.coli, as this will help interpret the article.