**MSc dissertation marking/feedback**

**Individual supervisor/internal examiner form**

This form should be completed *independently* by each marker *prior* to the viva examination.

# Student details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student name | Muhammad Faisal |
| Student matriculation number | 40583155 |
| Student programme | MSC COMPUTING |

# MSc dissertation module details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of dissertation | Data De-Duplication based on Secure Hashing |
| Submission date | 18/04/2023 |
| Supervisor | Stefano Cherubin |
| Internal examiner | Amjad Ullah |

# Confirmation of authorship

## Supervisor only: Turnitin

In ALL cases the supervisor MUST check the work’s originality report on Turnitin following the procedure outlined on the MSc dissertation module web pages (please see the “Forms” page).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Turnitin similarity percentage. | 20 % |

## Supervisor/internal examiner: association with the work, Internet searches

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I have had a close association with the development of the work | Yes/No |
| Internet searches have been completed | **Yes**/No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that this is the student’s original work | Yes**/No**[[1]](#footnote-1) |

# Assessment of work against module learning outcomes 1-4[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Grade scale for individual learning outcomes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Match to meeting of learning outcomes** |
| F5 | *Clear fail*. No evidence of this learning outcome having been addressed in the work completed for submission. |
| F4 | *Clear fail*. It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address this learning outcome, but this has been completely unsuccessful. |
| F3 | *Clear fail*. It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address this learning outcome, but this has been largely unsuccessful. |
| F2 | *Inadequate work*. Some examples of the work showing evidence of this learning outcome having been met, but insufficient to merit a pass grade. |
| F1 | *Marginal fail*. The work just misses the standard for a pass grade because it cannot be argued that this learning outcome has been met in full. |
| P1 | *Bare pass*. There is evidence that this learning outcome has been met. |
| P2 | *Adequate work*. It is clear that this learning outcome has been met. |
| P3 | *Good work*. In respect of this learning outcome, the work represents a good, solid performance at Masters level. |
| P4 | *Very good work*. In respect of this learning outcome, the work represents a very good performance at Masters level. |
| P5 | *Very strong work*. In the respect of this learning outcome, the work represents a strong performance at Masters level. |
| D1 | *Distinction*. In the respect of this learning outcome, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. |
| D2 | *Clear distinction*. The work is outstanding in meeting this learning outcome at Masters level. |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcome 1** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| *Conduct a literature search using an appropriate range of information sources and produce a critical review of the findings.*    **Markers assess**:  The range of materials on which the literature review, or exposition of theory and/or background information for highly technical projects, is based.  The actual output in the form of the literature review/theory exposition/background information provided in the dissertation. | F5 | The literature review chapter provide some details to the related concepts. However, chunk of contents keeps repeating, e.g., from Page 15 to 21. There is also some contents on the concept of ‘data de-identification’ (page 14), which isn’t relevant to the topic in hand. Lastly, it also lacks on providing any analysis of related work. |
| F4 |
| F3 |
| F2 |
| **F1** |
| P1 |
| P2 |
| P3 |
| P4 |
| P5 |
| D1 |
| D2 |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcome 2** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| *Demonstrate professional competence by sound project management and (a) by applying appropriate theoretical and practical computing concepts and techniques to a non-trivial problem, or (b) by undertaking an approved project of equivalent standard.*    **Markers assess**:  Project management (supervisor only).  Application of appropriate theoretical and practical computing concepts and techniques to a non-trivial problem or its equivalent (both markers). | F5 | The project aims to avoid data repetition/duplication using the secure hash algorithm. The student includes a chapter on analysis and design, methodology, followed by an implementation chapter. However, apart from implementation, the details provided in other chapters are of generic nature but do not provide specific details. For example, it says, requirements for the implementation and needs of data will be collected. However, throughout the dissertation, no information is provided on what are these requirements. Furthermore, there is mention of data collection, questionnaire, etc. However, no specific details relevant to the project is provided.  To summarise, the overall contribution of the project is very minimal. This involves the use of hash function to convert data and then compare hashes to check, if the same hash already exists or not. |
| F4 |
| F3 |
| **F2** |
| F1 |
| P1 |
| P2 |
| P3 |
| P4 |
| P5 |
| D1 |
| D2 |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcome 3** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| *Show a capacity for self-appraisal by analysing the strengths and weakness of the project outcomes with reference to the initial objectives, and to the work of others.*    **Markers assess**:  Self-appraisal provided in the report through the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the project with reference to initial objectives.  Self-appraisal provided in the report through the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the project with reference to the work of  others (i.e. content of literature review/exposition of theory and/or background information for highly technical projects). | F5 | The project initial objectives are clear. However, the overall contribution is minimal, and the dissertation reports miss some important aspects, such as a detailed analysis of related work, and evaluation are missing. Furthermore, the overall quality and structure of the dissertation is poor, not consistent and consist of a lot of repetition. |
| F4 |
| **F3** |
| F2 |
| F1 |
| P1 |
| P2 |
| P3 |
| P4 |
| P5 |
| D1 |
| D2 |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcome 4** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| *Provide evidence of the meeting learning outcomes 1-3 in the form of a dissertation which complies with the requirements of the School of Computing both in style and content.*    **Markers assess**:  Style and content of the written up output as a report of the research. | F5 | The overall dissertation structure and writing quality is poor and with too much repetition. The contents lack critical analysis, detailed evaluation and appropriate level of contribution. |
| F4 |
| F3 |
| **F2** |
| F1 |
| P1 |
| P2 |
| P3 |
| P4 |
| P5 |
| D1 |
| D2 |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

# Independent mark – marker to circle grade scale for the work as a whole

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Match to overall performance** |
| F5 | *Clear fail.* No evidence of learning outcomes having been addressed in the work completed for submission. |
| F4 | *Clear fail.* It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address the learning outcomes of the module, but this has been completely unsuccessful. |
| F3 | *Clear fail.* It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address the learning outcomes of the module, but this has been largely unsuccessful. |
| **F2** | *Inadequate work.* Some examples of the work showing evidence of the learning outcomes having been met, but insufficient to merit a pass grade. |
| F1 | *Marginal fail.* The work just misses the standard for a pass grade, e.g. because not *all* learning outcomes have been met. **NB if any of the 4 LOs assessed at this stage are assessed at F1 or below, a grade of F1 or below must be assigned as the independent grade for the work as a whole**. |
| P1 | *Bare pass.* It is possible to argue that all learning outcomes have been met. NB all 4 LOs considered at this stage must be assessed at P1 or above for a pass grade to be recorded for the work as a whole by the independent marker. |
| P2 | *Adequate work.* It is clear that the learning outcomes have been met. |
| P3 | *Good work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a good, solid performance at Masters level. |
| P4 | *Very good work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a very good performance at Masters level. |
| P5 | *Very strong work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a very strong performance at Masters level. |
| D1 | *Distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *may merit further dissemination* in some format. |
| D2 | *Distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *clearly merit further dissemination* in some format. |
| D3 | *Clear distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed clearly merit further dissemination and *may be worthy of publication*. |
| D4 | *Clear distinction.* The work is outstanding in meeting the learning outcomes at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *clearly merits further dissemination in published form*. |
| D5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Summary of grade justification for the work as a whole  The overall dissertation structure and writing quality is poor and with too much repetition. The contents lack critical analysis, detailed evaluation and appropriate level of contribution. Lastly, the student answers were not satisfactory and coherent with the dissertation report. Part of the implementation code was also not well explained. | |
| Signature (type name here and upload to SharePoint as Word document.) | **Amjad Ullah** |
| Supervisor/internal examiner name | **Amjad Ullah** |
| Date | **28/04/2023** |

1. Please consult with the module leader immediately if this statement cannot be answered with a “Yes”. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Learning outcome 5 is assessed at the viva examination. The report on learning outcome 5 is given on the *joint* marking form.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-2)