Marking criteria for BIA4 ICA 1 - group work

A (90-100%)

Excellent submissions, showing a high level of understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and a clear group effort (proportionate to the group size) fall into this category.

- The group produced a software with a clear and well-motivated purpose towards solving a problem in biomedical imaging.
- Documentation is of excellent quality, written in clear and correct English, and makes it very easy to use the software.
- The Python code is well organised, clearly commented, and fully functional. The report clearly shows the functionality of the software, by showing examples of its output (whether correct or incorrect).
- The software is easy to use.

Exceptional submissions (over 95%) show all of the above, and

- Are robust to working with a variety of input images or able to handle incorrect user input correctly (e.g. through error messages or similar mechanisms).
- Show evidence of good programming practice, such as code versioning, good code organisation and commenting, and use of functions and classes where appropriate.
- If relevant, they might show further analysis or quality control of the output.

B (80-89%)

Very good submissions, showing a good understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and a clear group effort (proportionate to the group size) fall into this category.

- The group produced a software with a clear purpose towards solving a problem in biomedical imaging.
- Documentation is of good quality, generally clear and/or with some minor English issues; it is generally easy to use the software.
- The Python code is fully functional but could be better organised; code is commented only in parts.
- The report shows the functionality of the software, but might have included further examples or explanations/analyses.

C (70-79%)

Good submissions, showing a reasonable understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and a some group effort fall into this category.

- The group produced a software with a clear purpose towards solving a problem in biomedical imaging. Documentation is understandable, but incomplete in parts or in need of improvement to help using the software.
- The Python code is fully functionaly or requires only minor adjustments to run; code organisation should be improved; code is only minimally commented. The report shows most of the functionality

of the software.

D (60-69%)

Satisfactory submissions, showing a partial understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and a limited group effort fall into this category.

- The purpose of the software towards solving a problem in biomedical imaging is only partially clear.
- Documentation is incomplete or difficult to understand. It is not obvious to understand how to use the software
- The Python code is functional, or requires some minor changes. Code is not commented, and organisation should be improved.
- The report shows some of the functionality of the software.

E (30-59%)

Poor submissions, showing a limited understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and a limited group effort fall into this category.

- The purpose of the software towards solving a problem in biomedical imaging is only vaguely clear.
- Documentation is very difficult to understand and not useful in order to use the software.
- The Python code requires major changes to work. Code is not commented and poorly organised.
- The report is lacking in detail.

F (0-29%)

Very poor submissions, showing no understanding of the biomedical imaging problem the group is trying to solve, and no group effort fall into this category.

- It is unclear what the purpose of the software is.
- Documentation is lacking or not understandable.
- Code is non functional.
- The software functionality is not shown by the report.