Student Name	Alexander Davis
Student Number	S14110259
Course and Year	
Module Code	CMP6012
Module Title	Individual Project
Module Leader	Fiaz Afsar
Assessment item:	Literature Review – Deliverable 2

Marker Name:	Yevgeniya Kovalchuk	Date:	21/01/2017

Feedback: General comments on the quality of the work, its successes and where it could be improved

You have included some good references with a considered and effective discussion around them. Some recommendations for improving your work are provided below.

I would suggest to avoid any strong claims/interpretations, such as "Unfortunately, Mental Health Issues are rarely brought up online on social media platforms". In fact, mental health issues are increasingly discussed on social media. Examples include dedicated "subreddits" on Reddit platform, threads in the Radio One Surgery's "The Student room", as well as your own examples from Facebook.

You should have acknowledged in Introduction that while your work is focused on a student cohort, the literature review considers a wide range of user groups (i.e. stratified by age, ethnicity, profession, etc.). Implementation of various features in the context of your project would be different compared to if you were to develop a similar platform for elderly, children, soon-to-be mums, etc. To reflect this, you could have included a wider range of references. For example, while you make an attempt to compare the USA and UK, the number of use cases is rather limited and doesn't reflect the recent trend of treating mental disorders on the equal terms to physical ones (and indeed, not to separate one from the other, i.e. adopt a more holistic approach to human health).

You could have discussed the major problem with social media that information posted there can't always be trusted and needs to be interpreted with caution (e.g. imagine a scenario when a marketing campaigner posts a blog advertising a non-registered medication or therapy).

The main shortage of your submission is lack of discussion around how your review relates and informs the development of your platform. For example, as a recommendation, you could have suggested a solution to the mentioned problem "that students' conditions may worsen if services are accessed using social media platforms". You could have listed features you'd like to include into your platform, e.g. a symptom checker, glossary, contact details of local doctors and organisations, blogs with useful tips and cautions, a professionally curated forum, etc.

Referencing and writing:
Table captions are usually placed above tables (while figure captions below images). Internet resources should be listed in References rather than named in Glossary (WebMD).

Progress:
Very good progress, but don't forget to log it using the Journal link on Moodle.

Feed Forward: How to apply the feedback to future submissions

Consider the above recommendations when developing your platform. Keep your Moodle Journal up to date.

Provisional uncapped mark: %	71	Enter Marks below first in boxes below then click Provisional Uncapped mark box to automatically calculate final mark ←
Marker to indicate Yes where applicable; ↘		
Work submitted late but within 2 hours of deadline		Mark reduced by 10% of the awarded mark[1]
Work submitted late but within 5 working days of deadline		Mark capped at minimum pass mark[2]
Work submitted more than 5 working days after deadline		Mark of zero
Support summary applied to original deadline	Yes	
Support summary adjustments applied to marking		
Proposed mark for submission to exam board[3]:		%

Quality and use of standard English & academic conventions				*Notes*
Spelling	Good			
Grammar	Good			
Punctuation	Good			
Academic Style	Good			
Structure	Good			
Referencing	Good			
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				

---

[1]Where the original mark was a pass and a 10% reduction would take it below a pass, the minimum pass mark will be recorded.
[2]The minimum pass mark for undergraduate programmes is 40% and for postgraduate programmes is 50%.
[3]Marks are provisional until confirmed by an examination board and may be altered up or down. Successful claims for extenuating circumstances will result in the marks submitted to the exam board being uncapped. Marks shown in Moodle are always the uncapped mark.

Marks awarded for criteria

Element	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100	Awarded
Use Of Research (30%)	Some sources used, but lacking academic credibility	Academic sources are used but show substantial limitations	A suitable set of sources are chosen, but there may be better alternatives available	Adequate sources are used but not thoroughly documented	Good evidence of the use of a set of suitable academic sources, covering an appropriate field	Very good selection and use of academic sources relevant to the project objectives. Credibility is clearly demonstrated.	Excellent selection and use of academic sources relevant to the project objectives. Credibility is clearly demonstrated.	70
Content Of Literature Review (50%)	Key issues have not identified.	Comparative content not clearly demonstrated, but there is some indication of ability.	Adequate use of research material in a topic that shows little scope.	Satisfactory use of research material showing considerations relevant to the project topic. Some evidence of analysis, comparison and interpretation.	Good use of research material showing considerations relevant to the project topic. Regular evidence of analysis, comparison and interpretation.	Very good use of research material showing considerations relevant to the project topic. Good consideration of issues relevant to the project topic in a critical manner.	Excellent use of research material showing considerations relevant to the project topic. Broad and in-depth consideration of issues relevant to the project topic in a critical manner.	70
Writing And Referencing (10%)	Substantially lacking academic rigour.	Writing or referencing is not suitable academic.	Adequate academic writing and referencing with substantial improvements possible.	Generally good writing and referencing, but improvements are possible.	A good academic writing and referencing style is shown. There are a small number of minor issues relating to writing and referencing style.	Very good academic writing and complete referencing throughout. There may be a very small number of minor issues relating to writing or referencing style.	Exemplary academic writing and complete referencing throughout.	79
Progress (10%)	Progress, on the Journal records or proposal is very poor	Progress to date is not adequate	Evidence of some work towards this deadline shown in the Journal	Good progress towards this deadline, with records in the Journal and supervision meetings	Good progress. This is shown through multiple journal entries and discussions with the supervisor.	Substantial progress to date shown through the Journal and through supervisor discussions.	Excellent progress to date shown through detailed journal entries and regular meetings with the supervisor.	70