

GROUP 2 – STATEMENT

OUR CASE FOR ALIGNMENT AND FULFILLMENT OF THE MARKING SCHEME

Suitability as a report and presentation to management – 10 marks

- **Spelling**

The document was checked for spelling errors.

- **Explanation of any technical terms used**

Technical terms were explained inline e.g. mojibake, and the use of technical terms are limited for readability.

- **Formatting**

The report is formatted to look like an easy-to-read scientific paper, with clear headlines, references, and labeled graphs and images. The two column layout allows for good readability, and the code samples in the appendix are labelled, well commented and only what is relevant has been added. A table of contents for the appendix was also added for quick reference.

- **Easy to follow**

The report is broken up into segments and there is a logical flow in the report, as it tells a story as it progresses. Each section flows into the other, and the conclusions obtained in each segment, it builds up to the final conclusions.

- **Follows structure as required.**

The backbone of the report is a Data Preparation, Analysis, and a Conclusion section. The report as a whole has this framework, and so does each analysis section.

Correctness and thoroughness of analysis – 15 marks

- **Use of appropriate techniques**

The rationale for our techniques is explained in both the report, and jupyter notebook, snippets of which are included in the Appendix. Assumptions and disadvantages to our techniques are also highlighted, and compared with the techniques used in research papers and by other reputable bodies.

- **Checking that the data meets any assumptions the model or test requires**

There is a section “Data Preparation” within the report that addresses these concerns. Each individual analysis section also tailors the data to support the needs of the analysis. The appendix also goes into further details of how the methods used are applied and why, to expand the body of the report.

- **Correct interpretation**

We do not overestimate claims within the report, or overstate the capabilities of the analysis, as backed by code samples. Both good and bad outcomes are shown, and anything hand-picked or hard-coded for optimisation is clearly stated. The facts within the report are backed by references that are listed in endnotes.

Presentation quality – 10 marks

- **Spelling** -- as stated above

- **Explanation of any technical terms used** -- as stated above

- **Formatting**

The format is similar to that of the report but with omissions of the low level details which can be spoken to, and also the omission of some of the graphs that can be inferred from the statements of other graphs included. There is a uniform structure throughout the report.

- **Easy to follow**

Arrows help guide the eyes, and numbered titles help the reader understand the flow of the segments as they appeared within the report.

Novelty – 5 marks

- Is this an interesting and different analysis?

An exhaustive analysis was performed on the data to determine correlations, trends/patterns in audience attendance, match outcome and overall wins. In each segment, there is an analysis of whether a prediction can be made using the information analysed at that stage of the report. Hypotheses were also made on methods of improvement, and comparisons drawn to other methods used.