Final Python Task Marking and Feedback:

Task 2.1. Excessive amount of cells for a simple inspection. [3/3]

Task 2.2-1. The images have been vetted with a huge amount of outputplots which don't actually say anything... statistics isn't actually done in terms of giving any particular numerical output.[3/6]

Task 2.2-2. Simple average was taken for the master image (no weighting was performed).

Statistical combination suggests that appropriate noise weighting is performed using the image sky background as indication of this. Master image via median is a good alternative, but not statistical. [3/7]

Task 2.3-1/2. ok [4/4]

Task 2.3-3. Generally ok, but a bit repetitive. [8/8]

Task 2.3-4. Executed comparison but comments are yet again a statement of what is found, rather than elaboration. [2/3]

Task 2.3-5. ok [2/2]

Task 2.3-6. Missing. [0/3]

Task 2.4-1. Basic sums performed. Photometry is achieved with square frames, ok.

Calculated the background as average of entire image instead of median of surrounding area.

All minor issues, but reduce the quality of the photometry. [6/8]

Task 2.4-2. Performed aperture photometry of fit (with same issues). The psf by definition fits an offset which can be removed prior to integration. [2/4]

Task 2.4-3. Attempted, but noise quantities not considered correctly. [1/3]

Task 2.4-4. Found the magnitudes of the stars on SIMBAD. [3/3]

Task 2.4-5. Simple comparison with some comments. [2/2]

Task 2.5-1. OK. [2/2]

Task 2.5-2. Ok. [2/2]

Task 2.5-3. Well performed. [4/4]

Task 2.5-4. Incorrect should compare photometry done here. [0/2]

Task 2.5-5. Good discussion, but does not actualy perform a fit which is what was requested. [2/6]

Style is ok. More use of loops and arrays instead of repetition of cells (including definitions). Plots are very good and tidy. Comments are generally very good. In some cases, attention needs to

be paid to what the task is asking you to do, as there seems to be interpretation confusion in some points. [7/8]