Expectations for Frequent Itemset Mining Project

Section 1 :
For library usage : 5

For self implementation (as per the tasks mentioned in project doc) :

- Code : 10
  Both the optimisations work : 10
  Only 1 work : 8
  Just the implementation works and no optimisation : 6
  Based on analysis in report :
- Partitioning Strategy or Hash Mapping mentioned : 2
  Binary marking
- Performance comparison of optimised vs unoptimised : 8
  Run on at least 2 datasets .

  Penalisation for :
  - If performance comparison done for one of the optimisation or no suitable comparison showed (through graphs, charts or tables)
  - Wrong or no reasoning
  - Subjective grace marks for verbose answers without any depiction (graphs, charts or tables) .
  - Run on 1 dataset only

Section 2 :
For library usage : 5

For self implementation (as per the tasks mentioned in project doc) :

- Code : 10
  Optimisation works : 10
  Just the implementation works and no optimisation : 7
  Based on analysis in report :
- The working of optimisation discussed : 2
  Binary marking
- Performance comparison of optimised vs unoptimised : 8
  Run on at least 2 datasets .

  Penalisation for :
  - If no suitable comparison showed (through graphs, charts or tables).
  - Wrong or no reasoning.
  - Subjective grace marks for verbose answers without any depiction (graphs, charts or tables) .
  - Run on 1 dataset only

- Bonus : 10
  Subjective grading based on how well the improved strategy is .

Section 3 :
Based on analysis in report :
Expectation : Run on few datasets and analyze the situations (e.g., data size, data distribution, minimal support threshold setting, size of desired frequent itemsets). Significantly different sized datasets to be used, varying minimum support thresholding (checking performance of apriori vs fp growth on a range of minimum support values) .
Penalisation for :

- Performance comparison made on only 1 dataset
- No comparison varying the minimum support threshold
- No argumentative reasoning