

Good research draft response essay example

[Philosophy](#), [Freedom](#)



Healthy Vegetarian Diet

Some of the areas where the author could improve on are as follows: (1) appropriate selection and use of transition statements to effectively introduce main points and arguments; (2) more proofreading to avoid repeated statements and phrases (for instance the statement “ lacto-vegetarian doesn’t eat red meat, poultry, fish, seafood” was repeated twice in the second paragraph located in page 1; (3) observing the explicit spelling out of the meaning of an acronym (where BMI was already initially mentioned in the third paragraph in page five, before it was explained in detail as to its meaning in the fourth paragraph of the same page; (4) there were improper citations (where the page number did not come immediately after the source in the second line in page 5) and referencing did not follow the double-spaced requirement; and finally, (5) inconsistency in discussing the contents (where the author already revealed that positive aspects of a vegetarian diet; but subsequent paragraphs located in pages three and four still discussed the negative effects, particularly focusing on calcium and Vitamin D deficiency).

Therefore, to answer the question on how well did the author relate back to the thesis in

the analysis, one could assert that the author did not effectively relate back to the thesis since the supporting discussion perused on different topics, including the negative effects in greater depth. The majority of the paper should have provided supporting arguments that focus on how vegetarian diet affect positively to our bodies. Concurrently, in responding to the so

what question, the author could be commended for appropriately asserting the valid rationales and support to the main point through concluding that the vegetarian diet is worth considering given the positive effects, as well as the ability to prevent diseases and live a health life.

Listen to the Walls Talk

As one reads on, it was surprising that there were no clear supporting arguments to this main point. Thus, one could hereby assert that there are various areas which could be improved, as follows: (1) observe appropriate choice of vocabulary and avoid repeated words within a sentence (idea was used twice in the last sentence of the first paragraph in page 1); (2) the thesis statement should be clearly established (is it asserting that graffiti is a form of freedom of expression? Or does the author content that graffiti should be legalized?); (3) the discourse have contents that do not form a cohesive whole since some areas merely discuss what graffiti or is not; with intermittent references to historical backdrops and citations from various authors; (4) there seems to be lack of transition statements, especially when introducing quoted works; (5) there was failure to adhere to grammatical rules, especially the correct form of the verb ' draw' (" which was drew" instead of " which was drawn" in the second paragraph in page six; and also " drew" instead of " drawn" in the third paragraph in page six; and finally, (6) sentences were formed using the compound or complex form which complicated the structure and meaning.

Finally, the author's inability to clearly identify the thesis (whether the paper's focus was on determining is graffiti is a form of freedom of expression? Or does the author content that graffiti should be legalized?) led

to the ineffectiveness in relating back to the supposed thesis statement. The concluding portions were therefore vague and dispersed. As such, in answering the so what question, the author also provided divergent arguments that did not unify or validate concluding remarks. It tried to combine re-asserting graffiti as a modern art that should be legalized; but the arguments that supposedly provide credence to this conclusion were weak (it represents the people and speaks for the people who could not voice their opinions). The author therefore failed to establish the main point that should have been the focus of discussion and even ineffectively provided consistent justification to support the major thrust, as required.