

Section 1:

#1 "To begin with, many people will lose the ability to see clear skies, due to pollution. This would affect many animals, including birds. Many birds get caught up in the grey skies, they lose the ability to see clearly. Many of these accidents result in horrible injuries or death. <https://www.forbes.com> states that nearly 1.5 billion birds die per year due to the cause of air pollution. Driving a petrol-based car would make twice as worse. Many cars would spew out litres of gas, polluting the air and making it hard for birds to fly through."

Strengths: You've included specific statistics to support your argument. Your concern for wildlife impacts adds an important ecological dimension to your argument.

Sentence structure issue → Your paragraph contains several sentences starting with "many", creating repetitive phrasing that weakens the impact of your important points. You've also included a sentence with comma splicing where two independent clauses are incorrectly joined with a comma.

Birds face dire consequences in polluted skies; they struggle with visibility, leading to injuries or death. According to Forbes, approximately 1.5 billion birds perish annually due to air pollution, and petrol-based vehicles significantly worsen these conditions.

#2 "Imagine this: a world where everyone has lost the ability to breath fresh air, where we have no more resources for the important things, and the skies are grey and filled with different chemicals. There is not a trace of light left to help the crops grow, and it's like it was the extinction of dinosaurs all over again, but instead of dinosaurs, it's us."

Strengths: Your opening creates a vivid scenario that immediately engages the reader. You effectively establish the serious consequences of environmental degradation.

Paragraph placement issue → This powerful imagery appears in your introduction but isn't clearly connected to your thesis statement. The dramatic scenario you've painted needs to be more directly linked to your main argument about car-free zones.

Imagine our future: a world choked by pollution where fresh air becomes a distant memory, resources dwindle, and toxic grey skies block sunlight from reaching our crops. This environmental catastrophe threatens human existence much like the extinction event that eliminated the dinosaurs—unless we take decisive action regarding urban transportation.

#3 "Many people argue that they are concerned for the world, as signs of pollution are starting to fill the air, and one of the major reasons is that we allow too many people to use petrol-based cars. I will argue, in this essay, that we should not construct more road in car-free zones. It may take away our skies and even lives."

Strengths: You clearly identify the focus of your essay. You've connected the environmental concern to a specific cause (petrol-based cars).

Thesis clarity issue → Your thesis statement appears contradictory to your supporting arguments. You state "we should not construct more road in car-free zones" but your evidence supports reducing car usage, not maintaining car-free zones as they are. This creates confusion about your actual position on the topic.

Environmental concerns are growing as pollution increasingly fills our air, with petrol-based vehicles being a major contributor to this problem. In this essay, I will argue that we should convert more urban roads into car-free zones, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists, as our current transportation systems threaten both environmental health and human lives.

■ Your piece shows good potential with strong emotional appeals and some supporting evidence. To improve the substance of your writing, focus on clarifying your position from the beginning—your thesis statement needs to match the arguments you present throughout. Your evidence about birds, resource waste, and human health impacts provides a good foundation, but each paragraph would benefit from deeper exploration of one specific impact rather than briefly mentioning several. Also, consider addressing the counterargument more thoroughly by acknowledging the convenience of petrol-based cars while explaining why the environmental benefits still outweigh these advantages. Try organising your paragraphs with a clear topic sentence, evidence, explanation, and link back to your main argument. When using statistics, provide context to help readers understand their significance—for example, explain what percentage of pollution comes specifically from cars versus other sources.

Score: 40/50

Section 2:

Should urban areas convert more roads into car-free zones, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists?

Imagine this: a world where everyone has lost the ability to ~~breath~~ [breathe] fresh air, where we have no more resources for the important things, and the skies are grey and filled with different chemicals. There is not a trace of light left to help the crops grow, and it's like it was the extinction of dinosaurs all over again, but instead of dinosaurs, it's us.

Many people argue that they are concerned for the world, as signs of pollution are starting to fill the air, and one of the major reasons is that we allow too many people to use petrol-based cars. ~~I will argue, in this essay, that we should not construct more road in car-free zones.~~ [In this essay, I will argue that we should convert more urban roads into car-free zones.] It may take away our skies and even lives.

#1 To begin with, many people will lose the ability to see clear skies, due to pollution. This would affect many animals, including birds. ~~Many birds get caught up in the grey skies, they lose the ability to see clearly.~~ [Many birds get caught up in the grey skies and lose the ability to see clearly.] Many of these accidents result in horrible injuries or death. <https://www.forbes.com> states that nearly 1.5 billion birds die per year due to the cause of air pollution. ~~Driving a petrol-based car would make twice as worse.~~ [Driving petrol-based cars makes this situation twice as bad.] Many cars would spew out litres of gas, polluting the air and making it hard for birds to fly through.

Secondly, critics argue that the many people who use petrol-based cars have wasted many resources. We could, instead, use it on more useful things, like rockets that could help us with researching space, or an invention that may come in handy in the future. Rockets use approximately 4,578,000 litres of fuel, which is at least a million cars. ~~If we construct more pathways for cars, that could add thousands of more petrol-based cars to the population of the ones we already have.~~ [If we construct more pathways for cars instead of car-free zones, that could add thousands more petrol-based vehicles to our already congested roads.]

Lastly, air pollution caused by ~~the~~ cars could affect us, not only animals. Many people obtain many illnesses, especially lung cancer. Lung cancer makes it difficult to ~~breath~~ [breathe] in fresh air, and many cases of this cancer often ~~leads~~ [lead] to death. <https://www.cleanairfund.org> has said that 1.8 million people die around the globe annually due to air pollution. If we drive petrol-based cars, we could make the air pollution stronger, resulting ~~to~~ [in] another million deaths.

However, petrol-based cars have many advantages. The fuel is always easy to buy for refilling, and there are many affordable and acceptable purchases in maintenance.

To conclude, I argue that we should ~~not open new ways for petrol-based cars to go through~~ [create more car-free zones in urban areas], as the result ~~could~~ [of continued car dependence would] take away many abilities, like sight, the ~~constructions~~ [construction] of new projects, and health, but it also has some advantages, especially points involved with affordable, cheap prices and cost.