

Section 1:

#1 Strengths: Your opening paragraph effectively introduces the topic of scientific advancement with vivid examples like discovering new worlds and bacteria. You've clearly established your position that scientific advancement is more valuable than artistic self-expression.

Weakness: Underdeveloped comparison → Your introduction states your position but doesn't establish a clear framework for comparison between science and art. For instance, when you write "I disagree that artistic self-expression is valuable to society than scientific advancement," you've missed explaining what artistic self-expression actually offers before dismissing it.

Exemplar: *I disagree that artistic self-expression is more valuable to society than scientific advancement, despite art's ability to inspire emotions and preserve cultural heritage, because scientific discoveries provide more tangible benefits through medical breakthroughs and environmental solutions.*

#2 Strengths: Your second paragraph makes a practical point about science solving real-world problems, using global warming as a relevant example. You've connected scientific understanding to actionable solutions.

Weakness: Limited evidence development → Your global warming example lacks specific details about what scientific advancements actually helped identify or address the problem. When you mention "When it was recognised in the community, people and organizations like EDF took action to reduce it," you don't explain what scientific research enabled this recognition or what specific actions were taken.

Exemplar: *For example, scientific research identified that global warming is increasing due to greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels, which led organisations like the Environmental Defence Fund to develop specific solutions such as renewable energy technologies and carbon capture methods.*

#3 Strengths: Your conclusion effectively restates your main argument and ends with a thought-provoking question. You've summarised your key points about science helping knowledge and inspiring youth.

Weakness: Logical inconsistency → Your conclusion begins with "Inconclusion" rather than "In conclusion" and contains an awkwardly phrased statement: "artistic self-expression is not valuable to society than scientific advancement." The comparative structure is unclear, and you haven't addressed any potential value that art might have while making your case for science.

Exemplar: *In conclusion, while artistic self-expression certainly has cultural value, scientific advancement offers greater benefits to society through expanding our knowledge, solving critical problems, and inspiring young minds. Would you still prioritise art over exploring the fascinating frontiers of space, medicine, and discovery?*

■ Your piece presents a passionate argument for the value of scientific advancement, but would benefit from deeper exploration of your key points. Each paragraph introduces important ideas but leaves them underdeveloped. For example, when discussing medicine, you mention statistics about diseases without treatments, but could strengthen this by including a specific example of a scientific breakthrough that saved lives. Additionally, your comparison would be more convincing if you acknowledged some benefits of artistic expression before explaining why science offers greater value. Your writing could also benefit from smoother transitions between paragraphs to guide readers through your argument. Try adding linking phrases at the beginning of paragraphs to connect ideas more clearly. Finally, consider expanding your conclusion to reinforce why your position matters—perhaps by painting a picture of what our world might look like without scientific progress compared to without artistic expression.

---

**Score: 42/50**

---

## Section 2:

Imagine you discovered a new world with unknown animal species or found a new type of bacteria. Scientists experiment and explore this as their career. This not only inspires the younger generation to explore the natural wonders of space but can save lives. I disagree that artistic self-expression is valuable to society than scientific advancement. #1

Firstly, it can solve our issues. We need to understand how things work and why it is occurring to fix it. For example, global warming is increasing because of the gas and burning of fossil fuels. When it was recognised in the community, people and ~~organizations~~ [organisations] like EDF (Environmental Defence Fund) took action to reduce it. #2

Moreover, it can save lives by creating new medicines to reduce the risk of the patient's death. In uncommon diseases, 95% of them don't have any remedy and the total human diseases have around 96% that don't have a definite one. We must continue to research for those who ~~suffocate~~ [suffer from] these medical issues.

Finally, it can inspire children. They can develop curiosity taking action to change the world while allowing them to experience fun activities. This could potentially be their job in the future. Therefore, scientific advancement is better and should be continued instead of artistic self-expression.

~~In conclusion~~ [In conclusion], artistic self-expression is not ~~valuable to~~ [as valuable to] society ~~than~~ [as] scientific advancement. Science can help ~~our~~ [expand our] knowledge, and we continue to create and

discover new solutions, encouraging youth to learn about it. Would you still rather ~~art~~ [choose art] than branching out deeper into aspects of space, bacteria and more? #3