

## Section 1

### #1: Opening paragraph

*Strengths:*

- You create vivid imagery with contrasting scenes ("murky waters with bleached coral" versus "crystal clear waters"), which helps readers picture the problem immediately
- The rhetorical question at the end engages readers by making them consider their personal responsibility

*Unnatural sentence construction* → Your opening question becomes confusing because it asks "Would you want to be watching... or snorkelling" which mixes two different activities awkwardly. The phrase "beautiful coral stretching out as far as the eye can see" also feels disconnected from the snorkelling action.

**Exemplar:** *Would you rather watch shallow, murky waters where bleached coral sways lifelessly in warm currents, or snorkel through crystal-clear waters amongst vibrant coral reefs teeming with life?*

---

### #2: Body paragraph about the Reef as an ecosystem

*Strengths:*

- You demonstrate understanding of the food chain by describing how predators hunt amongst schools of fish
- The contrast between "bountiful Reef" and "ghostly white coral" effectively shows the change

*Underdeveloped reasoning* → Your paragraph asks "Should we destroy this ecosystem for the sake of our planet?" but this question doesn't make logical sense. You're actually arguing we shouldn't destroy it FOR the planet, not for something else. The connection between protecting the ecosystem and protecting the planet isn't clearly explained—you need to show why the Reef matters to the whole planet's health.

**Exemplar:** *The Reef supports countless species and helps keep our ocean healthy. When we destroy it, we're not just harming one place—we're damaging an ecosystem that affects marine life across the entire ocean.*

---

### #3: Counterargument paragraph

*Strengths:*

- You address opposing views, which strengthens persuasive writing by showing you've considered different perspectives
- The explanation of coral bleaching shows specific knowledge about how the process works

*Weak connection to main argument* → After explaining that coral can recover, you don't clearly link this back to what actions people should take. You mention "if the water cools down" but don't explain how your earlier suggestions (picking up plastic, saving electricity) actually help cool the water. The scientific explanation feels separate from your call to action.

**Exemplar:** *Since coral can recover when water temperatures drop, our actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—like using less electricity and choosing sustainable transport—directly help the ocean cool down and give coral the chance to survive.*

---

■ Your piece presents a passionate argument about protecting the Great Barrier Reef, and you clearly care deeply about this environmental issue. The structure follows a logical persuasive pattern with an introduction, body paragraphs, counterargument, and conclusion. However, your writing would become much stronger if you developed the connections between your ideas more thoroughly. For instance, in your second paragraph, you list three ways humans harm the reef (burning fossil fuels, destroying forests, tossing plastic), but you don't explain how each one specifically damages the coral. Your readers—especially those who might disagree—need to understand these connections to be convinced. Additionally, your third paragraph about the ecosystem raises an excellent point about the food chain, but it ends abruptly without explaining why losing this ecosystem matters beyond the Reef itself. Does it affect fishing industries? Tourism? Human food supplies? These practical consequences would make your argument more compelling. Your counterargument paragraph shows good critical thinking, but after explaining coral bleaching, you need to explicitly state: "Therefore, by reducing our carbon emissions through these specific actions, we can lower water temperatures and allow coral to recover." Right now, your readers have to make that connection themselves. Finally, your conclusion

asks readers to help but could be more specific—instead of general suggestions, you might explain "When you pick up plastic at the beach, you're preventing it from breaking down into microplastics that smother coral" so readers understand exactly why their actions matter.

---

Overall Score: 43/50

---

## Section 2

Would you want to be ~~watching~~ **[snorkelling through]** shallow, murky waters ~~with~~ **[where]** bleached coral ~~lifelessly swaying~~ **[sways lifelessly]** in the unusually warm currents, or ~~snorkelling under~~ **[diving beneath]** crystal clear waters, swimming amongst beautiful coral ~~stretching out~~ **[that stretches]** as far as the eye can see? In fact, statistics say that 73% of surveyed coral has shown signs of bleaching in 2024. Is it worth ~~our decisions that pollute and heat?~~ **[making decisions that pollute our oceans and heat our planet?]** Or should we choose more sustainable options in order to stop climate change and save the reef?

The Great Barrier Reef is loved for its great size. Many dream of seeing colourful coral and beautiful reef fish swirling in the cool currents. However, most of the coral is already bleached and the fish no longer thrive amongst the once-lively reef. Who is the culprit? Us. We burn fossil fuels ~~so that it warms~~ **[which warms]** the ocean. We destroy forests, so that oxygen supply for the reef is limited **[which reduces the oxygen supply needed by marine life]**. We toss plastic in random places ~~so that it~~ **[which then]** strangles and smothers the coral. Is this what we really want? For the next generations to criticise us for not saving the reef for them? For our children's children to wonder why ~~did we not save it?~~ **[we didn't save it?]**

The Reef is also an important ocean ecosystem. It is filled with life. Fish and sea creatures find their homes in cracks in the Reef. Predators swim hungrily around the bountiful Reef, looking amongst huge schools of fish ~~as to decide~~ **[to decide]** which fish are ~~the best to~~ **[best suited to]** satisfy their hunger. But right now, the ocean we are ~~reforming~~ **[transforming]** is way different now. Most of the Reef is just a colony of ghostly white coral now. All the fish have gone, and so ~~do~~ **[have]** the predators that follow them. ~~Should we destroy this ecosystem for the sake of our planet?~~ **[Destroying this**

**ecosystem would harm not just the Reef, but the health of our entire planet.]** This is why we definitely should protect the Great Barrier Reef.

However, some people say that climate change has had a **[such a]** ~~too~~ severe effect on the Great Barrier Reef ~~so~~ **[that]** nothing can really be done. They also claim that it would be impossible to fully reverse the effects, and we should focus on keeping the Reef as it is right now rather than undoing the effects. But the conception of the Reef being 'dead' is incorrect – we still have a chance to undo most of the effects. The reason why? Coral bleaching happens when coral are stressed and they expel the colourful algae. The symbiotic relationship between them then breaks. But the coral still have a chance to get the algae back – that is, if the water cools down and they relax. So the coral isn't dead. Not just yet.

The Great Barrier Reef is a natural treasure of the world. If we don't protect it now, then we will surely lose it forever. Help by picking up plastic when you see ~~them~~ **[it]**. Help by saving electricity. Help by encouraging sustainable things. Together, we can make a better future with and for our Reef. Keep the Reef alive, let the planet thrive!