

Right off the bat, ChatGPT didn't do horribly. I think the essay is well-written and thought out. There were a couple of points that GPT came up with that aligned with mine, such as better surveillance, stricter science protocols, and better response training. These matched very closely with what I came up with. With that in mind, GPT also didn't support its fixes with solid evidence, it was mostly what logically makes sense. Being unable to surf the web, that was expected. It also seemed to take my suggestions rather literally. I asked it to emphasize the logos, ethos, and pathos in the essay, it then added specific descriptions of how each point aligned with ethos, logos, and pathos. This is not ideal. Overall, GPT did a solid job writing the essay. Does it line up with the standards outlined in class, no. The lack of research-supported claims, solid numbers, and usage of descriptors to invoke pathos is why this is so. I believe with more refinements, ChatGPT could write a very good essay that aligns with the class standards, it would just take some time and thoughtful tweaks to the output.