

In the beginning of the course, I was asked to address any topic related to aging, survival, health span or longevity. I chose to discuss Covid-19 because it is currently one of the most prevalent threats to our global survival and remains at the start of every conversation. Throughout the course of my search, I relied heavily on online research tools and accessing the UC Davis library VPN but due to technical difficulties I struggled to completely access materials from the library, but I continued my search for primary resources via Google Scholar and the National Center for Biotechnology Information. I looked for scientific literature reviews, studies, journals, and continued my subscription to the New York Times to keep myself updated on latest information regarding Covid. I found invaluable resources simply by using Boolean search operators, a skill I acquired in high school. I was also able to use my UC Davis email as a way to access medical and scientific journal publications.

The way in which I found or obtained information was not as important as the content itself because my topic of immunology and Covid was so broad. It was not a matter of finding information but sifting through the plethora of material to pick the most relevant sources. Before I started looking for information, I already had a clear idea of what I was going to write about since the moment the term paper was announced, and I was able to refine my searches based on my key points I wanted to hit from my outline of the paper. I kept a running doc for notes, ideas, questions that came up and still needed to be resolved, transition or closing statements, and catalogued all sources in a table by date accessed, quick summaries, and links so that I can always go back to them. I attended seminars about Covid, watched YouTube videos that broke down medical and Covid concepts to help build a searchable vocabulary of Covid terminology. YouTube was a surprisingly invaluable resource that I used as a launchpad to find primary sources that the videos mentioned or referenced. I was able to find interactive websites published by the research arm of universities intended for education, which did not just act as a resource for the paper but as a legitimate teaching tool that I learned from so that I could write more accurately about the topic of immunology. Overall, my strategy was to remain observant while watching videos, reading the news, or following a lead from one primary source to the next.

When the course was over, I stayed with my paper because I knew it could still be improved but obtaining thorough and helpful feedback for a long review paper was somewhat of a challenge. The following quarter I enrolled in Dr. Carey's workshop to continue revising my paper for another quarter. I reached out to Dr. Carey to get in contact with his past students to receive individualized feedback, and I was successfully able to receive incredibly helpful feedback from a past Lang Prize winner. I also signed up for an Aggie Transcript seminar and learned to apply more revision strategies to my paper, around that same time I got in contact with the Dartmouth College National Collegiate Journal of Science and was able to receive more critical feedback about the paper's present form which I am submitting today. When I wrote the paper, I knew I wanted to center my information around topics that would not change so drastically as more information became available so that the currency of the information remained significant.

My outlines are extremely basic, every key point needs a claim, evidence, and warrant. I used these three aspects of a key point as criteria for the evaluation of my sources' relevance to the overall theme of survival. I learned to think about longevity as not a conversation about aging and death as discrete occurrences that happen at certain stages in a person's life. Death is not a single

grim reaper but more like a pack of devils constantly at work to hinder and eventually terminate function. Most of the time identifying a single cause of death is misleading, there are many contributing factors. This idea framed most of my scope and helped me decide that immunology was the way I wanted to talk about Covid. I wanted to touch on innate and adaptive immunity because they are the pack of devils contributing to death. I then looked for sources that actively discussed causes of death in the form of autopsy reviews of Covid victims. Immunology was a way to build the scope of the paper for the main key point and piece of evidence which was the case study. The case study of a person who died from the virus is the reason we should care about the content of the paper and the bigger picture I address in the end, which is that we have a weakened immune system inside our bodies and inside our society.

The content of this review is not unique but the way in which I presented the topic through my breakdown of innate and adaptive immune response and connecting these factors to the Covid case study is original, and the way I pursued the topic was genuine because of family members I lost to Covid. Writing about the virus became less desensitizing and more personal. Rather than rely on appeals to authority, misinformation, or consensus formed opinions about Covid, I felt empowered to research the virus so that I could be in control of what I understood and sharing that information with other readers is the purpose of this review.