

	Understanding and Explanation of the project background, questions, approach, solution techniques (20 points)		Replication of the Study (40 points)		Innovative Ideas or Methodology Expansion and/or comparison of data and results (30 points)		Completeness of report (10 points)	
Excellent	Detailed, accurate explanation of the project background and approach, solution technique used in the paper. Key equations are presented correctly, and the methodology is clearly described.	20	Successful and accurate replication of the paper's results using the provided or new dataset. The results are presented clearly and match closely with the original study. Code is well-organized, well-documented, and fully reproducible. GitHub repository is clean and easy to navigate. Results can be reproduced without issues.	40	Presents well-thought-out and novel improvements to the methodology or applies new methods/data that were well-justified based on the study's research question. Clear, thorough comparison of the original results with the new methods.	20	The analysis of the work conducted highlights your comprehension and shows insight into the significance of the results. The report has a critical review of the article. The report concludes with a clear concise summary of the outcomes – in context of the article and literature.	10
		18		36		18		9
		16		32		16		
Very Good	Very good definition of project topic, problem and/or hypothesis. Good understanding of the methodology with minor gaps in clarity or depth of the explanation.	15	Replication is mostly successful with minor deviations from the original results. Clear explanation of differences is provided. Code is organized and documented, though some parts may lack clarity. Reproducibility is possible with minor issues.	30	Attempt at suggesting methods for improving the methodology or applying new methods/data, but the explanation lacks clarity or the application is not fully justified. Results comparison is present but lacks depth in analysis or has minor issues with performance metrics.	15	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension and some insight into the significance of the results. The report has a critical review of the article chosen. The report concludes with a clear summary of the outcomes and brings recommendations for continuation and improvement of the work.	8
		14		28		14		7
		13		26		13		
Good	The explanation is superficial, missing project background, approach, and key technical details or has incorrect presentation of important equations.	12	Replication is incomplete or has significant discrepancies with little explanation for the deviation. Code is poorly organized or minimally documented, making	24	Some attempt to improve or expand on the methodology suggested or some attempts in applying new method/data	12	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension of the project but limited insight into the significance of the results. The report has a	6
		11		22		11		5
		10		20		10		

			reproduction difficult.		implemented. Some results comparison provided.		critical review of the performance. The report concludes with a summary of the outcomes and brings recommendations for continuation of the work.	
Satisfactory	The background and methodology are understood to some degree or explained, but report did not provide sufficient explanation of them.	9	The replication is to some degree unsuccessful or lacks significant effort. Little comparison or explanation is given for failure to replicate results. Code is disorganized, undocumented. .	18	Minor or superficial improvements or idea, with little attempt to implement new methods/data or relevance to the original research question. Results comparison is minimal and lacks clarity or is based on inappropriate metrics.	9	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates the discussion in chosen article. The report has a critical review of the performance. The report concludes with a summary of outcomes.	4
		8		16		8		3
		7		14		7		
Poor	The actual explanation of work shows very little understanding of background, methods, approach, and key questions.	6	The replication is unsuccessful. No comparison or explanation is given for failure to replicate results. Code is disorganized, undocumented, or non-functional, and results cannot be reproduced.	12	No attempt to improve or expand on the methodology or using new data. No results comparison or improper comparison provided.	6	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates limited comprehension. The report concludes with a poor summary of outcomes.	2
		3		6		3		1
		1		1		1		
Final Mark out of 100	Examiner Name:		Date		Comment:			