ELB 214				
Sno	**REG No**	**Name**	**Comments**	**verdict**
1	ENC222-0368/2016	Michael Wafula Wekesa	study area map legend is wrong. modify title. use 3 decimal places. redo conclusion as per objective. title - remove "AND MAPPING' From main iobjective - remove "MAP" and remaion with "ASSES" Improve stude area map - Shoreline change analysis - reduce the decimal Animation - you cannot annimate few slides - have them in pannels check the classification accuracy - you cant have 100% generic conclucion - conclusions should flow from objectives and major results	minor
2	ENC222-0408/2017	KHATSENZIA FAITH	period/gap schedule. parcel/day irrigation timetable for areas to irrigation. how does ur schedule compare with current status; its not clear how you got yield from biomass How does your proposed schedule merge with what is on the ground - the current practice? Final irrigation schedule should be a amap and not a table make your maps legible	minor
3	ENC222-0149/2017	OKELLO JACOB OKOMO	change title to modelling HABs. sensor is a footnote. check 2018 data. conclusions should be responses to objectives ; check the correlation values of chlorophyl-a concetration for 2018 - it appears odd one out from others conclusion generic - tie conclusion to major results	minor
4	ENC221-0390/2016	Ngeno Kevin Kiprotich	quantification of runoff by landuse classes missing - this you must do as it is the major focuss of your project Poorly done. Insufficient work done on the project despite stating 30 years.	major
5	ENC222-0168/2017	SIMIYU BRIAN CHELOTI	no citation in your work. study map is wrong. results are wrong. ; results do not make logical sense - check the projection of the various datasets you are analysing;	major

6	ENC221-0308/2016	ABDIRAHMAN Abdikarim	quantify accessibility area. ; Add major road trunks to your final maps to provide orientation 1st conclusion is generic - tie to major results is the study differentiating to and from town? Good work in general	minor
7	ENC222-0122/2017	HARRIET MUTHONI	cite findings of objective 1. ; Poor conclusion weak analysis	minor
8	ENC221-0295/2016	MWANDAZA John Lugwe	take care of others factors attacking coconuts; How did you identify coconut from the classification? What is the source of slide 31? How did you elliminate other factors so that you can attribute the change in greeness to the pest?	major
9	ENC221-0293/2016	ATENYA BONVEAL MAGOSLO	recheck pricing model; re - look at the price variation analysis	minor
10	ENC222-0150/2017	OKINYI BRIAN OBARE	lacking conclusion re-look at fractal analysis graphs	minor
11	ENC222-0356/2017	MBURU EILEEN NJOKI		minor
12	ENC221-0294/2016	OANDA Bonventure Maeta		minor
13	ENC221-0098/2016	MWANZIA Sharon Ndungwa		minor
14	ENC221-0161/2016	KIMANI Joy Christine Nduta	is it speices diversity or forest density What are the input parameters to the Shannon index? What's the value of this index in the study? How was the AGB/AGC results validated? Check for Multicollinearity	minor
15	ENC222-0138/2017	Muthee Ian Macharia	progress; progress not good problem statement neds to be refined -you cannot say cellular automata is not fully developed as a problem	major

16	ENC221-0322/2016	MARA Lemayian	done; title too long epochs too wide sediment export maps seem to havea problem -they are too smooth/ uniform did you do flow accumulation to ascetain portion of sediments ending up in the lake methodology does not support conclusion How did you settle on Soil loss as the key driver to the changing lake surface area ?	minor
17	ENC222-0157/2017	OWUOR DAVID OUMA	predict fishing zones; add prediction component Find other factors and justify why not use them predict in to the future at least a week in advance	minor
18	ENC221-0300/2016	NYAMWEYA Dianah Kemunto	lacks prediction ; elimination of factors/ models not clear how can you say you are presenting the best model yet you only comparing 3- specify these 3 in the objectives you are supposed to present the results of these 3 models followed by their statistics then statement of choice conclusions are generic -tie them to specific objectives and all major results there exists short term rainfall forecasts -why not use them Scanty presentation - the component of delineating floods from S1 was not adequately addressed. What future data was used?	minor
19	ENC222-0425/2017	WANJIRU Linus Kiboi	done; Changed title - list needs updating The list of factors are not conclusive enough No need for cartograms	minor
20	ENC222-0159/2017	WELDON KIPNGETICH RUTO	conclusion to be based on objective; see the supervisor to explain what and how you have done the project It is no clear why S2 - an optical image was used in this case	minor
21	EN221-0301/2016	Hurrystar MORAA Ombonga	done;	minor
22	ENC222-0375/2016	Jared Odiwuor Onyango	simple project. Done why do you need image enhancements before ndvi results, methodology and analysis do not match	major

23	ENC222-0125/2017	KETER MARION JEROTICH	data resolution issues. Done; generic conclusions maps too smooth to be results of analysis soil water content values are unrealistic-check definitions and validity extents from literature Not very clear what student has done. The approach of extracting points from coarse resolution and then interpolating is not appropriate	minor
24	ENC221-0297/2016	IMUNDE Rehema Kinya	more to be done;what are the units for dem -km or m you have not done any recovery assessment what happeneed to the vegetation recovery materials sent to you by your supervisor Project too simplistic,. Student needs to rethink and work closely with the supervisor	major
25	ENC221-0318/2016	KAHUNYO Faith Warigia	mask out unsuitable areas	minor
26	ENC221-0331/2016	AKELO Paul Otieno	compare gis identified dumpsites vs actual number of dumpsites	major
27	ENC221-0321/2016	KOIGI Njoroge	done; you need to complete the validation using the stream flow data	minor
28	ENC222-0119/2017	DANTON CHERUIYOT	objective 1 - rephrase . "Develop" to "derive" discussion- specify which months the drought occurred instead of years explain the similarity in the patterns -you cannot simply say they are smilar	minor
29	ENC222-0136/2017	MANG'OI BOBLENNY M.	research should be on builtup area only; you need to consult your supervisor more for guidance you do not pick points from a raster than krige to get a raster-this is wrong ;	major
30	EN281-3822/2015	MOGAKA Japheth Isaboke	done;	minor
31	EN281-5241/2014	BORU Jirma Christopher	revise overlay; some figures not legible- improve figure legibility include the look up table in your report Analysis of GW potential alone is rather simple. You need to enhance your work. Work is insuffiecnt but with guidance from supervisor it can be enhanced	minor
32	ENC222-0130/2017	KIPYEGON AMOS	fill gaps Revise the flowchart to be easily understandable. What's the role of Landsat in generating 10m CWSI?	minor

33	ENC222-0134/2017	LESOMO LOOMONI	more to be done;results not supported by solid analysis -you need to redo the analysis in consultation with your supervisor what is DPSIR? Student did not follow the framework and work done is insufficient. Whereas the project is feasible he needs to work closely with the supervisor	minor
34	ENC222-0424/2017	GICHARU JOHN GATHUITA	simple approach results not supported by solid analysis -you need to redo the analysis in consultation with your supervisor Student needs to work comprehensively and finish the tasks as required	minor
35	ENC221-0335/2016	KIPKEMOI Kevin	too simple methodology insufficient with limited number of flux net towers -so how did you do the comparisons trend maps need to have one scale WaPOR- is it insitu ? Why use it as a validation product ? Probably you could try 3 corner hut method Projects sounds too abstract for us to assess the students capacity and worked done.	major
36	ENC222-0127/2017	KIMANI MERCY NJOKI	process not clear problem statement is generic why do you need to smoothen the data insufficient work The RMSE is quite high! Why? Did the student use a tool to compute the index? Why not use standard RS software? Work looks insuffiently done and student does not seem to understand the scope. Supervisor to guide and ensure that the right work is done	major
37	ENC222-0116/2017	BUSOLO ELVIS TEMBEDE	done validation missing Provide a comprehensive list of the potential drivers	
38	ENC221-0311/2016	KIMEU Faith Mwende	done you need proper interpretation of PC2 Very great work. Student to consider a publication	minor
39	ENC222-0118/2017	CHIRCHIR S JEPKEMBOI	not well executed Change the algorithm to make it spatial.	major

40	ENC222-0141/2017	MWARE MORGAN INEMA	AIC is higher. All products to be resampled to lowest resolution dataset need to demostrate to the supervisor what is being done and how it has been done Student has made progress compared to last presentation on the new project but the overall scope seems rather narrow	minor
41	ENC222-0378/2016	Suolo Arnold	not well done how does land degradation come form SWAT you need further understanding of what land degradation is ; The methodology does not necessarily represent degradation. There are gaps the student and supervisor will need to address and re-align	major
42	ENC222-C009-0131/2016	SOITA LEAH CATHERINE	methodology insufficient the biggest indicator of food accessibility is the ability to afford represented by poverty levels results are not logical Methodology of what was done is very unclear! Student to work with supervisor	major
43	EN283-C009/0099/2015	KIPTUM VINCENT ?	?	fail; TO CONTACT coordinator
44	EN283-0611/2015	GACHECHE SAMUEL MUNDIA	poor work why both RAI and SPI ? Results do not make logcal sense and has no link to the methodology refer from past publications the implememtation of SPI and RAI ; Work incomplete. Student has to focus and work harder	major
45	ENC222-0357/2016	Kiplangat Bett Frankline	poor methodology land use lanc cover change analysis missing impact of land use land cover change on algae distribution missing work closely with your supervisor ; Work is incomplete. Objective #2 is not complete, student has not discussed why use multiple sensors	major
46	ENC222-0133/2017	Ian Ngibuini	statistical study epoch is course generic conclusions results not logical ; It is not convincing that the surface area of the lake is increasing neither is the temperature is decreasing	minor

47	ENC222-0492/2016	Daniel Musungu	done insufficient methodology and results -you cannot do averages and call it a project ; Correlating rainfall and maize yields is a fallacy especially knowing that the area relies on rainfed agriculuture	major
48	EN281-0528/2014	Lelelit Josephine	statistical precipitation is averaged over wht region the ground water fluctuation looks spurious how did you validate the water balance model work closely with the supervisor The Water balance model is not clearly described by the student. She needs to clearly explain the workings of the model. Validation is missing/poorly explained. No data maps were provided	major