**Kasia:**
Going into this presentation (and most of the other presentation topics as well), I was very unfamiliar with the ionosphere. I thought the introduction to the ionosphere was well made and, even as someone who knew next to nothing going into it, I was able to get a good grasp of the presentation. Of particular interest to me was the use of the Chapman function (although I'm biased because of my presentation). It was interesting to see the method used in a situation other than that of the ozone layer I spoke of in my presentation. Since so much effort was spent keeping the derivation general for this exact reason, it was nice to see it used in a very different situation. The discussion of the effect of stellar variation (eg. sunspots) was an interesting factor that I hadn't put much thought into in my derivation as well.

**Nick:**
I'd heard descriptions during undergrad about Rayleigh scattering and how it makes the sky appear blue during the day and red during sunset, but I hadn't ever actually put any thought towards the blue sky seen post-sunset, so I thought the description of that case was really interesting. I had also never heard much about Mie scattering that I can remember (essentially I just knew there was something by that name but nothing beyond that), so hearing a little about it and the difference in the strength of its effects on the colour of the atmosphere between Earth and Mars was fascinating.

**Callum (myself):**
The main point of my presentation that could use some improvement was having more diversity in my sources. I referred to only (very old) works by Chapman, and, while they are well-established papers in the field, the undiversified nature of the presentation can allow rampant bias and would benefit from having more varied viewpoints. I also think that I could've made the connection between the regeneration of ozone and the rate of dissociation/ionization more obvious, as it is the whole foundation of the method.

**Luke:**
Again, I knew virtually nothing about buoyancy frequency going into this talk. I thought that it was very well introduced though, and the visualization of the oscillating packet really helped establish the system in my opinion. In particular, I thought the final slide (I think it was the final slide) did a very good job connecting the buoyancy frequency to bolides, microbaroms, etc. was very interesting. I thought the discussion following the presentation was very interesting as well.

**Victoria:**
It's weird given that rain is such a common phenomenon, but I'd never actually given any thought to how rain drops actually form and grow within the clouds. I sort of just

assumed that it was a relatively simple system similar to that of the collision-coalescence process, but I had no idea that it was as complicated as it is. I was also surprised at how recently our current understanding of how the largest rain droplets formed came to be, I would've assumed it had been well-known for a long time. I also didn't know how important a role micron-sized dust particles played in the formation of raindrops.

**Vasura:**
During various undergrad courses, I had come across plenty of discussion about the greenhouse effect and how it compares between Earth and Venus, but the discussion was always limited to basic qualitative properties. I didn't know that you could create a basic model of the system using such simple math. It was interesting to be able to associate actual numbers and math to the ideas I'd heard about before.