

Assignment Marking Report

Assignment Details:

Assignment: s227284240 - Final Report.pdf
Rubric: IEMT302 Research Report Rubric
Total Points: 100
Marked Date: 2025/11/03

Student Information:

Student Name: Tino Mhedziso

Score Summary:

Total Score: 82.00 / 100
Percentage: 82.0%
Grade: A-

Detailed Criteria Scores:

1. Title Page

Score: 1 / 2 points

Feedback: The title page includes most of the necessary elements such as the student's name, institution, and date. However, it incorrectly lists the qualification as a Bachelor of Information Technology instead of a Masters Degree, which is inconsistent with the level of the treatise. To improve, ensure that all details are accurate and reflect the correct academic level.

2. Macro-structure

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise includes all required sections, such as an abstract, introduction, literature review, and conclusion. The word count appears appropriate for a Masters-level document. However, the depth of analysis in some sections, particularly the literature review, could be expanded to include more comprehensive theoretical foundations. Consider adding more detailed subsections to enhance clarity and depth.

3. Presentation Styles

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise demonstrates proficiency in presentation styles, with consistent formatting and clear headings. The use of styles enhances readability and helps guide the reader through the document. No major improvements are needed in this area.

4. Navigational Aids

Score: 4 / 4 points

Feedback: The table of contents, lists, and page numbering are well-executed, providing a clear navigation structure for the reader. This aids in locating specific sections and enhances the overall usability of the document. Continue to maintain this level of detail in future works.

5. Appendix Titles & Item Captions

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: Appendix titles and item captions are effectively descriptive, providing clear context for the supplementary material. This enhances the reader's understanding of the additional data presented. Ensure that future appendices maintain this level of clarity and relevance.

6. Figures, Tables & Equations

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise makes substantial use of figures and tables, which are generally well-

integrated into the text. However, some technical details, such as the explanation of equations, could be handled with more precision. Consider providing more detailed captions and explanations to enhance comprehension.

7. Flow of Text

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The text flows coherently, with well-structured paragraphs and logical progression of ideas. Linking sentences are used effectively to connect sections. This contributes to a clear and persuasive argument throughout the document.

8. Internal Referencing

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: Internal referencing is proficiently demonstrated, with clear links between sections and references to figures and tables. This aids in the reader's understanding and navigation of the document. Maintain this level of detail in future works.

9. External Referencing

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise demonstrates proficiency in external referencing, with accurate and consistent in-text citations. This supports the credibility of the arguments presented. Ensure that all sources are up-to-date and relevant to the topic.

10. Reference List: Form

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The reference list is well-organized and predominantly in order, following a consistent citation style. This enhances the document's professionalism and academic rigor. Continue to ensure that all references are complete and correctly formatted.

11. Reference List: Authority

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: References provided are predominantly authoritative and academic, contributing to the treatise's credibility. Ensure that future works continue to draw on high-quality sources to support arguments and conclusions.

12. Vocabulary & Terminology

Score: 4 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise demonstrates an excellent synthesis of appropriate terminology and vocabulary, reflecting a deep understanding of the subject matter. This enhances the clarity and precision of the arguments presented. Continue to use technical language effectively in future works.

13. Tone & Voice

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The tone is generally formal and consistent, suitable for an academic audience. However, there are occasional lapses into less formal language. Ensure that the tone remains consistently academic throughout to maintain professionalism.

14. Authority & Credibility

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise does well to establish authority and credibility, drawing on a range of authoritative sources. However, some arguments could be strengthened with additional evidence or expert opinions. Consider incorporating more diverse perspectives to enhance credibility.

15. Reader Engagement

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise is patently aware of the reader and frequently establishes an authentic connection. However, some sections could be more engaging by directly addressing the reader's concerns or values. Consider using more examples or case studies to enhance engagement.

16. Data & Reasoning

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise presents persuasive argumentation supported by accurate data and generally sound reasoning. However, some sections could benefit from more detailed analysis or additional data to strengthen the arguments. Ensure that all claims are well-supported by evidence.

17. Summary

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The summary is substantially concise and complete, effectively encapsulating the main points of the treatise. This provides a clear overview for the reader. Continue to ensure that summaries are comprehensive and focused.

18. Introduction

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The introduction adequately introduces the topic, rationale, and aims, with only minor details requiring clarification. Consider expanding on the background information to provide a more comprehensive context for the reader.

19. Applications / Use Cases

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise presents illuminating and relevant applications and use cases, effectively demonstrating the practical implications of the research. This enhances the reader's understanding of the topic's significance.

20. Antecedents

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise comprehensively identifies and critically contemplates relevant antecedents of the selected emerging technology. This provides a solid foundation for understanding the current research context.

21. Catalysts / Drivers / Enablers

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise comprehensively identifies catalysts, drivers, and enablers of the selected emerging technology. This enhances the reader's understanding of the factors influencing the technology's development.

22. Growth Prospects

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The treatise comprehensively identifies growth prospects of the selected emerging technology, providing a clear vision of future developments. This enhances the reader's understanding of the technology's potential impact.

23. Ethical / Societal Implications

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise adequately identifies and critically contemplates some important ethical and societal implications of the selected emerging technology. However, a more systematic exploration of these issues could enhance the analysis. Consider incorporating more diverse perspectives to provide a balanced view.

24. Problem / Opportunity Statement

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The treatise includes a well-formulated statement of the identified problem or opportunity. However, some aspects could be more concise to enhance clarity. Consider refining the statement to focus on the most critical elements.

25. Conclusion & Recommendations

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The conclusions and recommendations are predominantly well-founded and consistent with the evidence presented. However, some recommendations could be more specific to enhance their practical applicability. Consider providing more detailed action steps.

26. System Design: Clear

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The purpose of most components is reasonably clear, as are their interfaces with other components. However, some minor details require clarification. Consider providing more detailed diagrams or descriptions to enhance understanding.

27. System Design: Systematic

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The system design demonstrates an adequately systematic approach to the problem/opportunity, albeit with minor exceptions. Consider refining the design to ensure all components are fully integrated and aligned with the overall objectives.

28. System Design: Efficient

Score: 2 / 2 points

Feedback: The system design is highly efficient, effectively addressing the identified problem or opportunity. This enhances the feasibility and potential impact of the proposed solution. Continue to prioritize efficiency in future designs.

29. Concise / Focused

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The report is generally concise and well-focused, with minor exceptions. Some sections could be streamlined to enhance clarity and impact. Consider revising these sections to remove any redundant information.

30. Consistent / Coherent

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The report is generally consistent and coherent, with minor exceptions. Some transitions between sections could be smoother to enhance the overall flow. Consider revising these transitions to improve coherence.

31. Accurate / Substantiated

Score: 3 / 4 points

Feedback: The report is generally accurate and substantiated, though with minor exceptions. Some claims could be supported with additional evidence to enhance credibility. Consider incorporating more data or expert opinions to strengthen these claims.

Overall Feedback:

The treatise demonstrates a strong understanding of the intersection between digital phenotyping, digital therapeutics, and neurotechnology, with a clear focus on enhancing human cognition. The structure is well-organized, and the use of technical vocabulary is commendable. However, there are areas for improvement, such as expanding the literature review, refining the introduction, and providing more specific recommendations. The system design is efficient but could benefit from clearer component descriptions. Overall, the treatise makes a valuable contribution to the field, but further refinement and expansion in certain areas would enhance its academic rigor and practical applicability.