To: Taj Tatla

From: Samuel King

Date: January 29,2016

**Subject: Review of Three Definitions: Photometry**

This is my review of your initial draft for the three definitions assignment in which you define the term "photometry". You have done a very good job detailing the term for an audience who does not have any knowledge in spectrophotometry. I recognize the complexity of this field and your definitions are easy to comprehend. The following is a summary on my thoughts and suggestions regarding your assignment.

**Audience:**

Your definitions have been written in a way that is educational for those unaware of this field in science. You built a solid foundation then gradually increased the amount of detail for the reader.

**Organization and Content:**

The organization of your assignment was well structured and concise. Each answer for the questions in the Expanded Definition portion was informative and easy to understand. To improve upon your layout I suggest to italicize the question headings in the Expanded Definition section as well as change the sub headings bold. This would make your post more aesthetically pleasing for the reader.

Only one sentence needs editing:

- "A specific field within physics is of optics." *Could be changed to* "Optics is a field within physics that uses photometry."

**Visual:**

Your choice of figure was excellent. It is bright, colourful, and the labels are easy to spot .Perhaps a photo showing what a Mass Spectrophotometer device looks like in real life would engage the reader even more so.

**Overall:**

You have put in an excellent effort explaining the complex term "photometry". Your post is educational, concise and very well organized. I particularly enjoyed your explanation of how photometric devices work and to me this demonstrates your knowledge of the subject matter. With just a few adjustments your definition assignment will be of even higher quality. If you would like to contact me to discuss my review, please do so at anytime.