

| | B139086 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Project planning and execution | 8.8 |
| Title, Abstract, Introduction | 7.7 |
| Literature review | 7.1 |
| Methods | 11.5 |
| Results | 19.6 |
| Discussion | 15.2 |
| Presentation | 8.0 |
| Section total | 77.8 |
| Word count penalty? | No |
| Final total | 77.8 |

| | <i>Academic style</i> | <i>W. Ai</i> |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| Project planning and execution | | 10 |
| Title, Abstract, Introduction | | 10 |
| Literature review | | 10 |
| Methods | | 15 |
| Results | | 25 |
| Discussion | | 20 |
| Presentation of written dissertation | | 10 |
| Total | | 100 |

Title, Abstract, Introduction, Aims and Objectives

Very strong.

The Title, Abstract, and Introduction, are very clear and with relevant information only

A very ambitious project. The context setting is very informative and engaging.

The Objectives are set out clearly and in line with context

Literature Review

A systematic literature not performed. The student argues that most of studies are grey literature. This is not entirely convincing, perhaps presenting search results to support that claim would had been more coherent. However, the description is very clear.

The subsections are great and cover the key aspects of ETS. It would be nice to have added examples (in terms of sequestration potential) of other carbon capture measures in relation to afforestation. Despite the focus on grey literature, scientific references for backing up some of the claims related to ETS were missing.

The gaps are clearly presented, but would be good to also cover methods that have been used for ETS.

Methods

An excellent description of model and data sources for an ambitious collection of data. One can guess, but it is also good practice to add the units of the parameters in Eq(1)-Eq(6)

Results

The presentation of data is very detailed, with sources and justification for use. Superb figures, although caption & keys are missing in a few cases; a few 'notes to self' remaining (e.g. 'SOURCE'; section ??)

The results are perfectly aligned with the objectives and nicely presented.

Despite a simple equation being used, lots of information is extracted from it, including uncertainty with PIUs.

Discussion

Very well thought out discussion on key points and interpretation of results are pertinent. Generally very thorough and mature. The student also shows a great understanding of the limitations of the analysis, particularly due to uncertainty of carbon sequestration and afforestation costs.

The published material is mostly grey literature. The analysis would have improved by comparing results with similar afforestation studies (for another regions if not available for the UK).

There were some slightly odd asides e.g. '(NOTE: I have also been told of confirmed sales of “well over £60/unit” and rumoured sales of £80/unit, but I didn’t get HERC approval so I’m not allowed to tell you that. . .)'. It also appears to be somewhat rushed e.g. Conclusions are short and incomplete

Presentation

Generally very high quality, mature writing although sentences could be shorter in places. Some slightly odd terminology in places e.g. ('guff-content') and asides (see above). It appears to have been submitted without a final check - perhaps a time management issue?

Formatting is excellent and very professional - and including hyperlinks to sections a great idea