Mark: 74

Feedback:

1st marker comment: Content summary: The summary in week 1 concisely covers the main concepts from the lecture and practical. Some discussion on the data or method would have been beneficial, although that is provided within the application section, being related to the summary section. The small presentation was excellent across all criteria. The week 3 summary would have benefited from a small introduction to the content here, however it goes beyond what was taught which is impressive. Week 4 is excellent. Week 5, again a short overview would have assisted the readability of the entry here. The image in week 7 nicely summarises the process of classifying imagery. Applications of the content: Applications in week 1 were excellent, I liked how each paper had been split into different sections and then a final thought was provided. The application in week 2 is rather methods heavy paper and the summary / content sections are excellent, although it would have been useful to compare this to another study, even just providing a small token comparison of 1-2 lines would have really demonstrated critical engagement with literature. Again, a similar comment to previous weeks for the week 5 entry. That said, the entry in week 5 is of a very high quality and the comments / limitations show critical thought about the study that was presented. Superb discussion in week 6, the application was related to the content of the lecture and the reflection on the main topic – does the most advanced ML produce the best results was fantastic. Personal reflection: Reflections are of a high quality and place the tools / ideas within broader considerations. Javascript is confusion! Overall this is a fantastic learning diary. 2nd marker comment: It's great to gain insight into your background and research interests through your introduction page. Your sections are well-structured, especially the application section. The comments and limitations demonstrate your critical thinking skills effectively. The work from week 4 is impressive; you compared several cities and specified your area of interest. You provided policies at different levels for comparison and offered decent explanations for the activities. The summary of how RS data would be helpful is well-summarized. In the GEE practical section, you presented some practice code and output, which is good. It would be even better if they were in code chunk format. Similarly, the work from week 8 is excellent. You conducted a thorough analysis of the background and the policy. However, the RS data seems to be missing from this section. Overall, it's a great job. There's not much to complain about, except that the literature could be more academic. Currently, it mainly consists of grey literature (governmental reports/websites), but it would be better to include more academic sources. However, this is a minor issue. Well done!