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Complete the table below to show evidence of the changes that you made from your first attempt. These changes must address the feedback that you received from your supervisor/examiner.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feedback from Supervisor** | **Evidence in Resubmission**  **(e.g. section or page)** |
| The report very briefly explains the problem. Aims and objectives briefly discussed.  The technical problem the app was trying to solve was not very clear. | Page 8, simplified the purpose of this project and what I hope to get out of it. |
| The final output is several disconnected HTML pages put together. | Backend is now complete, and the website is now fully functional. Shown in resubmitted files. |
| The report is not well written, inconsistencies throughout. The flow of ideas are good, but discussion is often missing. Inconsistent white spacing. The report includes too many large figures which takes unnecessary space. | Filled in the blanks and now should make sense as the application is pretty much completed |
| Testing section is just a table with completion rates of the RQs. | 15,16,17,18 – Functional, Non-functional Requirements testing  44,45,46,47 – Unit Testing of code |
| The project was not ambitious and did not include any technical challenges. | Now uses APIs, Uses HTTP Requests, Dynamic Rendering, Authorisation, Gamification Elements introduced and working |
| No testing or evaluation to speak of. | Unit testing and requirement testing used  Evaluation has been rewritten according to new updates |
| Not much enthusiasm, and no clear explanations of what went wrong. | Have rectified the mistakes/incompleteness and have now completed the application |