

<u>Undergraduate Programmes - Individual Post-Module Assessment Report</u>

Module code, initials and date:		WM275 Machine Intelligence	
Name of mark	er: <u>Manoj Babu</u>		
	Award	ded Mark	7
	please note that this doe	s not include late penalties,	

66

NOTE: The mark recorded is subject to review by the Board of Examiners.

which will be applied to the mark in Tabula)

Please note: while each PMA is marked against assessment criteria that are specifically designed to evaluate that assignment, the descriptors listed on the following webpage will help you to interpret the mark awarded to your work:

https://warwick.ac.uk/services/aro/dar/quality/categories/examinations/marking/ug2017/

Module Learning Outcomes

The tutor has indicated below if you have achieved the module learning outcomes. They can be "Met", "Partially Met" and "Not Met".

Learning Outcome	Status
Define an intelligent agent and comprehend behaviour of agents	Met
Explain the difference between simple and complex decisions	Met
Solve problems using searching and exploration techniques	Met
Apply different forms of learning techniques such as decision trees and logical hypotheses of learning	Met

lease note: some module learning outcomes may be addressed by other assessments or in- nodule work.
<u>Individual Comments</u>
he tutor has provided specific comments on your work below and they may have provided an annotated script.
Strengths & Areas for Improvement
<u> </u>
tudent: 1921983
/ritten Report (70%):
eport formatting is good and has all necessary components.
nswers to questions in Section 1 are partially correct. Steps/calculations to arrive at answers
or questions in Section 1 are partially shown. Answer to Q3 is incorrect, the correct answer is
.933. P(+r,+c) is wrongly calculated.
ttributes of the decision tree are clearly explained. The decision tree is clear and utilises all
ttributes.
ecision tree and decison boundary for Data 1 are partially correct. Decision tree and decison
oundary for Data 2 are partially correct. Rules at decision nodes follow specified instructions. Il answers are correct, however the decision boundaries illustrated are not correct. They do
ot form a box as illustrated, regions on the ends would extend to infinity.
nswers to Q1 in Section 3.1 are correct. Priority queue could have been described in further
etail, for instance by describing its pop, update and push methods. Answer to Q3 is correct.
ode Part (30%):
ode is submitted. The code throws no errors when run.
FS algorithm is correctly implemeted. The case of find no solution could have been handled etter.
FS algorithm is correctly implemeted. UCS algorithm implemented is partially correct. There i
n error while considering the path cost to add to the priority queue.
n error while considering the path cost to add to the priority queue. Code is clearly commented throughout and shows good understanding of the code. How to improve

Document structure, grammar, referencing

Anything else	
· ·	