**COM2005 Group Project Mark Sheet – Group 11**

Note: these are group marks only – individual marks may be different and will be released separately.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Comments** | **Mark** |
| **Abstract and Introduction** | Abstract covers general features of model but specific client problem is not introduced. This could have been mentioned earlier in the Introduction section. | 6/10 |
| **Literature Review** | Good brief introduction to historic development Cellular Automata and an overview of some existing models, including non-CA approaches and their primary findings. You could have commented on advantages/disadvantages of different approaches or mentioned issues of parameterisation of these models. | 15/20 |
| **Model Description/Methodology** | Good attempt to relate your assumptions of behaviour and parameters to the literature. Good use of figures to communicate methodology though I would have liked to see a ‘per cell’ flow/decision chart in place of figure 2 (e.g. if cell is not on fire 🡪 is any neighbour on fire…..). Parameter values could have been tabulated. Provided terrain map is not included and how you have incorporated the effect of water is not mentioned. | 14/20 |
| **Code, simulations and results** | You have explored effect of wind speed on relative time to reach town with clear presentation of results. I am slightly confused as to whether the behaviour shown in Results figure 2 is reasonable as imposing wind from north should surely increase fire spread to south? The time points on this figure are not stated. It is difficult to interpret figure 3 as there is no quantitative explanation of results. Long term intervention is clearer. No indication that repeat simulations were run to account for stochasticity, though this is touched upon in your discussion. Code is functional , well commented and a readme file supplied. | 13/20 |
| **Discussion and Conclusion** | I can’t relate your “5 and 10 day” figure stated at the start of this section with the results presented in your previous tables (though the “relative” time that you were asked for does agree. You have not dedicated much discussion to the questions posed by the client, but your wider discussion of the realism, limitations and possible improvements to your model is very good, as is your attempts to compare your approach to published work. | 16/20 |
| **Presentation** | Well written with good standard of English and generally clear and concise descriptions. Good use of figures, though some double labelling (i.e. you have two figure 1’s and figure 2’s). Colour keys should be included with complete information in captions. Good consistent referencing style and within specified page limit. Code elegance could have ben improved by eliminating unused imports and commented out instructions, using consistent variable naming conventions and separating monolithic code into separate functions. | 7/10 |
| **Total** |  | 71% |