

Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph): a. Strengths:

- You introduce the topic with a compelling real-world example.
- You pose a thought-provoking question to engage the reader.

b. Weaknesses: Lack of Focus Your opening paragraph lacks a clear thesis statement. You begin with a specific example of the 2019 bushfires but then abruptly shift to a broad question about climate change without establishing a clear connection. This sudden transition leaves the reader unsure of your main argument.

c. Exemplar: "The 2019 Australian bushfires, which devastated wildlife and required extensive government and public intervention, highlight a crucial question: In addressing climate change, are systemic changes by the government more effective than individual actions by the public?"

#2 (Second paragraph): a. Strengths:

- You provide a definition of systemic changes.
- You attempt to discuss both advantages and disadvantages of government action.

b. Weaknesses: Underdeveloped Arguments Your points about government action lack depth and specific examples. Phrases like "have control of pretty everything" and "much much more" are vague and don't provide substantive support for your arguments. Additionally, your discussion of potential problems is not clearly linked to climate change initiatives.

c. Exemplar: "The government can enact systemic changes through legislation, such as implementing carbon pricing or setting renewable energy targets. While these measures have the potential for widespread impact, they may face challenges in implementation or public acceptance."

#3 (Conclusion): a. Strengths:

- You attempt to provide a balanced view by weighing different options.
- You state your personal opinion on the matter.

b. Weaknesses: Insufficient Justification Your conclusion lacks a thorough justification for your stance. The statement "most of the other points go to the government side" doesn't provide a clear, evidence-based reasoning for your position. The phrase "the

government normally overrules them anyway" introduces a new point without proper elaboration.

c. Exemplar: "After weighing the evidence, I conclude that government action through systemic changes is more effective in addressing climate change. While individual actions are valuable, the government's ability to implement wide-reaching policies and regulations provides a more comprehensive approach to this global issue."

Actionable Task: Rewrite your introduction and conclusion, focusing on clearly stating your thesis in the introduction and providing a well-reasoned justification for your position in the conclusion. Ensure that you maintain a clear link between your main argument and the evidence you present throughout the essay.

Overall Score: 41/50

Section 2: Revision Guidelines

Systemic Change's Part in Opposing Climate Change

We all might remember, back in 2019, when a huge bushfire erupted, nearly killing 3 billion of our animals. The government sent out nearly all of our firefighters to set the fires out, while members of the public volunteered and also helped. So which one is better for climate change? #1

Firstly, I'll talk about the government. They are allowed to make systemic changes, which are changes to the law to either restrict and/or help. There are many different advantages to the government. Being able to change things that are big or small, ~~have~~ [having] control of ~~pretty~~ [practically] everything and much ~~much~~ more. They can help, by putting a fine for littering, and doing things that are not sustainable. However this can lead to multiple problems. These consist of having too much fame and not making the right decisions, like putting a too cheap fine for anyone to care, and even ~~overlook~~ [overlooking] the sustainability issue. These could also easily be avoided by consistently making sure that the people in charge are still worthy. #2

Secondly, I'll look at the other side, the public. They can do something called individual actions. These are if you recycle a lot and make sure everything is reused until they are completely ruined. These actions can not stop, but slow the climate change rate, by not doing anything unsustainable, and encouraging people to be sustainable too. They also can group together and make a better team than the government.

Lastly, let's balance and weigh the different options. Firstly, are the points, though the public can do some things that definitely are better than the government, like grouping

together, most of the other points go to the government side. Also, the government normally overrules them anyway.

~~Therefore, I personally think that the government can do better things with climate change.~~ [In conclusion, based on the evidence presented, I believe that the government's capacity for systemic change makes it better equipped to address climate change effectively.] #3