IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	**Glasgow** 2484370D **DCU** 20109661 **Charles** 16972321 **Trento**
Dissertation Title	Wars With Heaven: Can Celestial Securitisation Produce Effective Planetary Defence?

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade	Late Submission Penalty
B1 [17]	B1 [17]	No penalty

Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)

Word Count: 23,431 **Suggested Penalty:** No penalty

JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).

Before Penalty: B1 [17]   **After Penalty:** B1 [17]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• Originality of topic	Very Good
• Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified	Very Good
• Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work	Good
• Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions	Good
• Application of theory and/or concepts	Very Good
B. Use of Source Material This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• Evidence of reading and review of published literature	Very Good
• Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument	Good
• Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence	Very Good
• Accuracy of factual data	Very Good
C. Academic Style This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• Appropriate formal and clear writing style	Very Good

IMSISS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• *Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation*	Very Good
• *Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)*	Excellent
• *Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?*	Yes
• *Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)*	Not Required
• *Appropriate word count*	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

This is an original piece of high-quality research. The author identified an interesting research direction and produced a meaningful contribution to the existing literature. However, not always does this dissertation maintain a clear line of argument throughout the text, sometimes jumping back and forth. The discussion of the link between SDI and NEOs, including in conceptual terms on which this dissertation is based, could have also been more elaborate as it is supposed to be the core of this study. The concluding section is also rather short and does not engage systematically with the key research questions.

Reviewer 2

This dissertation seeks to address an original and potentially significant topic. There is strong evidence of wide-ranging reading and critical thinking. However, the design of the project is not fully coherent, notably because there are two distinct research questions that have been identified, rather than one. The dissertation then has two parts that do not fully relate to each other: a somewhat normative and speculative discussion concerning the threat from NEOs in future and an analysis of the SDI in the 80's. There is a significant gap between these two issues that never gets entirely bridged. The project would have been more coherent if it had focused on the SDI and had been embedded in that literature. Moreover, although it was a good idea to try and use securitization theory, one would have expected the dissertation to also engage with the academic discussions on the normative aspects of securitization (e.g., Floyd) and those problematizing and reflecting on the issue of the 'extraordinary' in securitization processes (e.g., Neal, Huysmans) given their relevance for the topic.