PROJECT FINAL MARK SHEET

UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA
School of Computing Sciences

CMP-6012Y/6013Y: Final Year Projects
ASSIGNMENT TITLE: PORTFOLIO (002) and INSPECTION (003)

Student Name: Nischal Poudel Student ID: 100288829

First Marker: Dr Jason Lines

Second Marker: Dr Min Aung

Date: 17/06/2024

	First Marker	Second Marker	Agreed Mark/100
Portfolio (002) /100	71.0	72.0	72.0
Demo (003) /100	74.0	68.5	71.0

Comments:

Report:

Good abstract that gives a clear overview of the project and what was achieved.

Good introduction but it would have been nice to have given stronger motivation in terms of why experienced machine learning users would benefit. Good that objectives were provided + priorities– however, a bit unclear that objectives and MoSCoW are separate. Also, the W should be for will not, not would have, as it is used to limit the scope of the project

Good background in terms of relevance and review. There are also some papers referenced later in section 4 to do with time series classification specifically. It would have been nice to give an overview of time series classification initially in the background before talking about specific papers to give more initial context.

Preparation is sound with good technical choices and good justification. Good that you have included some design documents, such as Fig 1, but the caption should be more descriptive. Good implementation with sound justification to stick to 1D data and a good sample of initial classifiers. It would have been good to have included functionality to allow users to set parameters, or at least some kind of default grid search, but this could arguably be provided via a custom classifier.

In terms of general formatting – figs should appear along with the text (not all at the end after the references) and figs should always be referenced in the prose – i.e. the text should always relate back to Figure x. Some small formatting and typo issues – for example, section 1.0.1 is a subsubsection without a subsection – all sections should be indexed from 1. Having 1.0.1 suggests that it could have been 1.1 (and then 1.2 could have either been 1.2.1 or 1.3). There are also cases with missing spaces – in the title for this section 1.0.2 “classificatoin(TSC)” but also in other areas, such as the could and would sections of the MoSCoW

Overall, a very good project and report with successful implementation of many key objectives. Well done

Inspection:

Well done on a very good presentation. Overall, it was clear that you had put care into planning and practicing your talk. I liked that you started with specific objectives and gave priorities but I would have liked to have seen a bit more motivation for the end-users beyond scientists from other fields - adding functionality to upload a classifier is great, but as questioned by the second marker, I think this needed to

be motivated more strongly in the talk (i.e. why would someone that knows how to evaluate classifiers be interested - i.e. to ensure a standardised and simple comparison to other algorithms that can use a consistent framework to avoid any questions about the experimental procedure). I think you did a good job of demonstrating the running of the software and it was nice to include a video for the CNN which wouldn't run natively on your laptop, however, this video did repeat some of the aspects you had already mentioned in the presentation (about setting up, setting number of runs, etc.). I thought you answered my question about documentation well, and while initially struggling a bit with the second marker's questions regarding parameters, I think you ultimately did a good job of reflecting and demonstrating your understanding of the question with a bit of gentle direction. Well done on a good presentation overall.