

To whom it may concern,
RE: James Eholm.

James approached me to undertake a research project during his summer vacation in 2014 (this demonstrated a high level of motivation and commitment). After a few discussions with James it quickly transpired that he understood the "research process", asked good questions, and was a joy to have discussions with. He grasped the basics of the material quickly, and soon began doing new work.

He deals well with difficult analytical problems, and is always willing to engage in technical and broad-brush discussions. James is very bright, and has a good analytical mind-set. He is not phased by the prospect of doing highly complicated tasks -- especially those he hasn't been given explicit guidance with.

At the end of his project he voluntarily produced a large (~50 pages) document: it was a mature and well thought out explanation and presentation of the results he'd obtained over the course of the project.

As far as I am aware, James had some personal issues in the first few years of his undergraduate studies. These may have had an impact on his grades, but they certainly do not reflect James' intelligence or suitability for a PhD position.

Based on my interactions with James, as his research project supervisor, I believe that he would thrive in a research environment.

With respect,

Jonathan Pearson.

Dr. Jonathan Pearson
School of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Nottingham,
Nottingham,
NG7 2RD