

Student Name:	Khai Ailyan
Student Number:	22130235
Module Code/Title:	CMP6200 / DIG6200 Individual Undergraduate Project 2024–25
Assessment Item:	A2: Literature Review (15%)
Marker Name:	Jan Krasniewicz
Project Title:	File Reverse engineering for the purpose of Game Preservation and Restoration to create an abstract tool for future Reverse engineering
Feedback: General comments on the quality of the work, its successes and where it could be improved	
<p>Source Appropriateness and Search Methodology (35%):</p> <p>Sources cited are appropriate, search methodology could be clearer in terms of which databases were used for the search and why. Keywords are satisfactory but need to look more broadly at other types of files common to older games. The RenderWare game engine files are one type, but you should consider other older game engines in order to look at the wider aspects of your work and how it can be applied to other game engines.</p> <p>Would help to give examples of the various themes. For example, give examples of file structures relevant to file syntax such as model files typically store floating point values representing vertex data (3D games) and texture files contain colour information. There's also the different underlying encoding used such as binary or text. ADTs in 2.1 could be clearer. ADTs more broadly are about data and the operations performed on it, don't get this from the report. Compression algorithms should consider issues relevant to consoles at the time, e.g. used HDD rather than SSD, slower CPU and RAM meaning a complex compression algorithm to reduce space may prolong loading times and users may complain about long loading times as a result or during the game.</p> <p>Appraisal and Critical Evaluation (35%):</p> <p>Satisfactory evaluation of topics. What would help is some detail on which areas will be explored. For example, which ADTs reviewed would be useful to the project? Reverse engineering techniques will be explored, purely file based or look at executable program too in order to gain an understanding of how files are read/written?</p> <p>Organization of Underlying Themes (20%):</p> <p>Not clear why order of themes was changed in literature review with file syntax appearing later on than listed in 2.1. Flow of themes/topics could be more logically presented. For example, main aim of the project is for game preservation so should explain what that means. Then elaborate of the themes relevant to achieve game preservation such as reverse engineering file formats.</p> <p>Academic Writing and Referencing (10%):</p> <p>Writing style is improved with few errors/omissions. When referencing multiple sources relevant to a section of the report, they are put in a list in brackets, e.g. (Harkai Istvan 2022)(Haydock Christopher 2018) would be (Istvan 2022; Haydock 2018). No first names in citations. Istvan (2022) full reference appears to be missing. Font size changes from 12 to 14 point. Need to be consistent with formatting. Don't need to say numbers of items, for example, in aims and objectives as this is too specific at this stage. Aims and objectives need to be high-level stating what will be done and not how or how many. The project is about decoding file artefacts into a form they can be used for other uses such as preservation or reuse in modern recreations of games or so the game can be upscaled in emulators. Some grammar/typographic errors remain such as starting sentences with lower case and "its" should be "it's" in some sentences. Could be clearer on applications of the work in the report introduction. Some American spellings used such as "Artifact" where should be "Artefact". Table has blank rows in it. Tables and figures need to have a title, e.g. "Table 1 – Keywords for literature search".</p>	
Feed Forward: How to apply the feedback to future submissions	

Areas for development and refinement:

Referencing style needs some corrections.

Need to be clearer on what areas in the various topics are going to be utilised in the remainder of the project.

Need specific examples or illustrations of artefacts in order to make discussion clearer.

Some dramatic language/terms like, “incredibly old”. Try to write objectively.

Summary of Marks by Criteria

Element	Weighting	Mark awarded %	Weighted mark %
Source Appropriateness and Search Methodology	35%	65	22.8%
Appraisal and Critical Evaluation	35%	62	21.7%
Organization of Underlying Themes	20%	60	12.0%
Academic Writing and Referencing	10%	55	5.5%
Total Mark (uncapped)	100%		62%

Quality and use of standard English & academic conventions				Notes
Spelling and grammar	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Academic style	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Structure	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Referencing	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Sources used	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
If any of the above are highlighted as Poor you should arrange a consultation with a member of staff from the Centre for Academic Success via Success@bcu.ac.uk or, for sources used, with the CEBE Librarian via https://www.bcu.ac.uk/library/services-and-support/book-a-tutorial .				

Assessment Criteria

Learning Outcomes to be Assessed:

1. Plan a research-informed project using appropriate literature and/or professional outputs.

Assessment Criteria →	1. Source Appropriateness and Search Methodology (LO1)	2. Appraisal and Critical Evaluation (LO1)	3. Organization of Underlying Themes (LO1)	4. Written Submission: Academic Writing and Referencing (LO1)
Weighting:	35%	35%	20%	10%
Grading Criteria 0 – 20% Fail	Little to no effort in finding or using relevant sources.	No evaluation or interpretation of sources	No organization of themes or incoherent.	Report has substantial shortcomings in most or all aspects.
21 – 39% Fail	Search methodology is weak or absent, leading to irrelevant or minimal sources.	Little comprehension or interpretation of sources.	Disorganized, with little structure in presenting themes.	Serious shortcomings but enough indication of ability to suggest some additional work should lead to a pass standard. Poor citing and referencing.
40 – 49%	Significant issues in search strategy, with some relevant sources but minimal critical evaluation.	Some evaluation, but critical thinking and interpretation are lacking.	Some evidence of thematic organization, but inconsistent.	Includes major elements but there may be omissions or shortcomings. The text may have significant shortcomings in style, language and/or lack of conciseness.
50 – 59%	Reasonable effort in searching for sources, with a fair selection. Basic evaluation and some critical appraisal.	Reasonable evaluation of key points, with some critical insight.	Satisfactory organization of key themes within sources.	Report generally follows guidelines including all main elements. There may be some shortcomings in clarity and some minor omissions of content. There is demonstration of ability to cite references correctly.
60 – 64%	Good source selection with clear relevance. Search methodology is solid and well-executed.	Good evaluation with clear evidence of critical thinking.	Well-structured and clear thematic organization.	No significant shortcoming in structure with all the main elements included. Style and language generally in accordance with the guidelines although there may be some minor deficiencies. There is demonstration of ability to cite references correctly.
65 – 69%	Very Good search strategy with well-chosen, relevant sources.	Very Good evaluation with clear evidence of critical thinking.	Very Well-structured and clear thematic organization.	Good structure with all the main elements included. Style and language generally in accordance with the guidelines although there may be some minor deficiencies. There is demonstration of ability to cite references correctly.

70 – 79%	Excellent search strategy with well-chosen, relevant sources.	Excellent evaluation and appropriate critical appraisal.	Excellent planning and clear theme organization.	<p>Succinct text with style and language in accordance with guidelines and with no significant shortcomings.</p> <p>Report includes all necessary elements and demonstrates an ability to distil content and cite references correctly.</p>
80 - 89%	Outstanding search methodology, resulting in excellent source selection.	Outstanding evaluation of sources, with strong critical appraisal.	Extremely well-established thematic organization.	<p>Clear academic style and language in accordance with guidelines and with no significant shortcomings.</p> <p>Report includes all necessary elements correctly cited and referenced.</p>
90 – 100%	Exceptional search strategy, with sources chosen to the highest possible standard.	Exceptional critical evaluation and appraisal of the literature.	Exceptional insight, with thematic organization demonstrating deep understanding.	Outstanding academic style and language in accordance with guidelines and with no shortcomings. Report includes all necessary elements and is a demonstration of ability to produce professional quality documentation.