Advanced Bioinformatics – cw1 assessment criteria

Student: Mohammed Bilal
Title of scientific report: Bioinformtic Problem
First marker: Andrew Tedder
Second marker: K. Poterlowicz

Standard of the scientific language, presentation of the report and ability to clearly communicate complex content					
0 - 6	**7 - 12**	**13 - 20**	**21 - 30**	**31 - 40**	**Mark**
Vague, unclear and overlooks much of the relevant logic and reasoning behind the presented solution, and has limited understanding of methods employed. Initial 'problem' is poorly explained/justified. Poorly written throughout, containing numerous grammatical errors. Content is presented in a confusing and incoherent manner. Figures, if present, are neither annotated correctly nor relevant to the subject being conveyed.	Unfocused with scant coverage of key logic and reasoning. May contain confused and/or non-relevant elements. Justification of methods employed is vague. The review contains a number of grammatical errors. On occasion, content is presented in a confusing and incoherent manner. Figures, if present, are annotated incorrectly.	Focused on the problem and solution but lacks depth or background in some explanations. Struggles to clearly communicate the more complex concepts. One or two grammatical errors present. Content is generally presented in a clear manner; however, occasionally information appears out of context. Figures, if present, are labelled and may include a basic legend.	Presents a mostly clear and detailed overview of the problem and solution with only occasional lapses in detail and/or clarity. Reasoning for methodological choices is well presented. The content is presented in a clear and logical order throughout. Figures, if present, are correctly labelled and include a legend.	Presents a clear and concise overview of problem and solution that is focused and clearly communicates complex concepts. All methodological choices are well defined, and evidence for alternative approaches is presented. The content is structured in a concise and logical order that facilitates understanding of the subject matter. Figures, if included, are directly relevant to the material, labelled and possess an informative legend.	**23**
Feedback: There is some good content here, with relatively clear explanations about why you chose certain methods, and how you employed					

them. Some of the content lacks clarity though (and references). Perhaps the major drawback in my opinion, is that you don't take the opportunity to put your method into context, and evaluate it, and that you don't attempt to put the results this generates into biological context (or in fact discuss them at all).

Quality of code and annotation

0 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 20	21 - 30	31 - 40	Mark
Code poorly written throughout, and potentially non-functional. Readability poor. Annotation either absent or insufficient for adequate comprehension.	Code functions on some example files, but not on others. Some annotation present but lacks detail. Functions and syntax used are rudimentary.	Code functions on all example files, producing a meaningful output. Annotation present for all key script elements. May have some elements, which are unnecessary, or redundant.	Code, annotations and output are all well presented, easy to understand, and generally the most appropriate solution for the problem. Clear instructions for code optionality are included where necessary.	Excellent use of novel and existing code elements, annotation and instructional material are thorough and precise. Output can be tailored to the user, and is presented in standard format.	**28**

Feedback: Use of functions is good, and elements of the code are well explained. My real issue here is that you address issues with running the alignment through python (rather than standalone) and issues of hardcoding as an afterthought at the end of the script, rather than actually implementing them. This really doesn't make sense, and prevents the script from working.

Quality of literature search and use of source material

0 - 5	6 - 9	10 - 12	13 - 15	16 - 20	Mark
Choice of source material is very poor and suggestive of a lack of understanding. Key articles are not cited, and other source material is irrelevant and/or out of date. Unacceptable formatting throughout, citations made in the text do not appear in the reference list and vice-versa.	Choice of source material suggests only a basic comprehension of the topic area. Key omissions and limited evidence of relevant primary source material. Some formatting errors evident e.g. citations made in the text that do not appear in the reference list and vice-versa.	Reasonable use of source material. Key texts in the topic area are cited and some effort has been made to supplement these with important emerging reports. One or two errors in citations or referencing evident.	Good use of source material that suggest a detailed understanding of the topic area and an appreciation of key articles that have contributed to the field. No errors evident in citations and referencing.	Excellent use of source material that cites the seminal work and backs this up with a selection of subsequent, key text that represent important steps forward in the field. No errors evident in citations and referencing.	9

Feedback: I think the material you cited is relevant and appropriate, but I simply don't think there is enough of it. In general, all statements that aren't explicitly your own (novel) ideas, should have a reference. In this case, you talked a lot in the introduction about some basic concepts, and some BRCA releated issues. These all needed references.

% mark: 60

Signed:

Date: 12.05.20