|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Score | Out of: | Comments |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | write equations with the word tool please and include the code in your report. |
| 2 | 9 | 15 | Although the time is very fast, approximating it to 0 does not allow a comparison in the table. Please use "time it" instead of "time.time" as for short functions it allows a better time measurement. The code otherwise is correct and well organized and includes all elements required. Should have compared each function's use and properties to identify the fittest for the matrix in the assignment as well as its time taken. The conclusion could be expanded further.  For example:  gaussseidel\_sol, gaussseidel\_number\_of\_iterations = gaussseidel(M, sol\_vec)  gaussseidel\_function = lambda:gaussseidel(M,sol\_vec)  end\_time\_gaussseidel = timeit.timeit(gaussseidel\_function, number=1) |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | Correct code, well structured and good exploration in the report. |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | The graph has all the correct elements and labels and is very easy to interpret. The code is efficient and well-structured. The report correctly analyses the graph and table's results. |
| 5 | 8 | 10 | Correct code and graphics, however all 4 lakes should have a graph not just lake Michigan. Moreover, an explanation on how to implement the 1000 tanks in the code could be useful to show understanding of the task. Good analysis from the results in the report. |
| 6 | 9 | 15 | Code is correct and good use of error as comparison tool. Very little analysis of the methods, should use percentage error as well as time taken to compare accuracy and efficiency of each. Overall, a better comparison and conclusion should have been made. |
| 7 | 15 | 15 | Correct code and use of Monte Carlo integration. Great comparison between integration methods. Good visuals with all elements present. |
| 8 | 12 | 15 | Correct graph and great visuals with all elements present, correct code. The report should have more exploration and explanation of what was done and how the analysis is relevant. |
| 9 | 8 | 10 | Correct code and visuals. Elaborate more on what the value found for maximum interpolant difference signifies for the data set. Between the comparisons use the theory for a further analysis and also percentage error. |
| 10 | 5 | 5 | Nice take for assessing sensitivity and detailed graphical analysis. Good motivation, well done |

TIPS:

* Try to use word equation functions and fit to page the text. Use academic report format such as page numbers. Do not use black tables as hard to see.
* Avoid time approximations to 0.
* Deepen your analysis using percentage error and time tools and compare and contrast using the functions properties and uses to further justify the choice of one option over others.

TOPS:

* Well structured code and efficient solutions to tasks. The many comments allow an easy consultation.
* Graphs and visual contain all correct elements and are very effective. The extra graphs in task 7 and 9 allow easy comparisons between methods. Tables are a great addition to the study.
* Great overall understanding and use of theory in report.