

2.1 Interpret cell observations and plan a fair biological comparison

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 24 marks**

KEY WORDS cell 细胞 • prokaryotic 原核 • eukaryotic 真核

Objective

Interpret cell observations and plan a fair biological comparison. This is original GAC023-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All supplied case data and review records are fictional; explicitly cited background is factual. The case data are invented for learning; they are not findings about a real school, country or population. Use the supplied evidence and do not invent missing observations.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Key knowledge: observed structures support a bounded interpretation rather than every life process**

A **cell** 细胞 is the basic structural and functional unit of living organisms. **Prokaryotic** 原核 cells have DNA without a membrane-bound nucleus. **Eukaryotic** 真核 cells typically contain a nucleus and other membrane-bound structures; some specialised cells lack particular structures. A missing feature in a low-quality image is not proof that the organism lacks it. Biology studies structure, function and change using suitable observations and investigations.

■ **Source A: text or task brief**

Historical context: Robert Hooke’s Micrographia was published in 1665 and used the word cell for the tiny spaces he observed in cork. This selected event is not the entire development of cell theory. Sources checked 2 October 2026: Royal Society history and digitised Micrographia.

Fictional prepared structural records, supplied as verified descriptions for this written task: sample A has a membrane, cytoplasm and DNA not enclosed in a nucleus. Sample B has a membrane, cytoplasm, a nucleus, a cell wall and chloroplasts. A separate image shows a cell 30.0 mm long on the printed page; its actual length is given as 0.0500 mm. These records are not live specimens and do not show reproduction or every life process.

■ **Source B: response or review record**

A student writes: “A has no DNA because it has no nucleus. B is a plant-like eukaryotic cell, so every cell in every plant must contain chloroplasts. The printed cell is actually 30 mm long. Its shape proves that it grows faster than A.”

The teacher proposes a separate, approved study of growth under two light conditions using comparable seedlings, controlled watering and a defined growth measure. No growth observations or light-condition results are supplied.

■ **Worked example: distinguish a verified structural record from a limited picture**



Known: A’s verified description places DNA outside a membrane-bound nucleus. Why identify it as prokaryotic? The stated organisation of DNA, not a claim that DNA is absent, supports that interpretation. B’s supplied nucleus and chloroplasts support a plant-like eukaryotic interpretation. A drawing alone cannot establish growth rate or all structures of an organism.

$$M = \frac{L_{image}}{L_{actual}}$$

$$M = \frac{30.0 \text{ mm}}{0.0500 \text{ mm}} = 600$$

Magnification is a ratio with the same units cancelled; it does not make the real cell longer.

2 Practice

2.1 Identify the publication and year associated with the supplied Hooke observation.[2]

2.2 Classify A and B from their supplied structural records. [2]

2.3 Calculate the image magnification and explain why it has no length unit. [3]

2.4 Correct THREE unsupported structural or scale claims in the student note. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Explain how the proposed growth investigation should produce a fair, bounded comparison using six points. [6]

3.2 Write an 80–110-word record summary separating structural interpretation, scale and the proposed investigation. [8]

Solutions

2.1

: Micrographia.: 1665. This date concerns the supplied historical event, not a claim that Hooke alone established all cell theory.

2.2

: A is prokaryotic because DNA is not enclosed in a nucleus.: B is plant-like eukaryotic from its nucleus, wall and chloroplasts.

2.3

: magnification = image length / actual length.: $M = 30.0 \text{ mm} / 0.0500 \text{ mm} = 600.$: compatible length units cancel; it may be stated as $\times 600$.

2.4

each: A does have recorded DNA; chloroplasts in B do not establish that all plant cells contain them; 30 mm is the printed image length, while actual supplied length is 0.0500 mm. Growth is addressed separately in the evaluation.

3.1

each: define light conditions as the changed factor; choose a specified growth measure and period; use comparable seedlings; keep watering or other stated conditions comparable; obtain approved safe procedures and repeated observations; do not infer results from cell shape or report a growth effect before data exist.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, 8 $\times$: recognise A's DNA; classify A; classify B with evidence; avoid universal chloroplast claim; state real image distinction; give $\times 600$ ratio; reject shape-based growth claim; describe the approved investigation as pending; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "The supplied description supports a prokaryotic interpretation of A because its DNA is not enclosed in a nucleus; it does not lack DNA. B has a nucleus, wall and chloroplasts, supporting a plant-like eukaryotic interpretation. These structures do not show that every plant cell has chloroplasts. The printed cell length is 30.0 millimetres, while its supplied actual length is 0.0500 millimetres, giving a magnification of six hundred. Shape alone does not establish growth rate. The proposed light comparison needs an approved procedure, comparable seedlings, controlled watering and a defined growth measure before any result is reported."