

Literature Review Marking – CA 2

Student Name: Ryan Habis

Total Score: 61 / 100

Criteria	Score	Justification
1. Clarity & Organization (20 pts)	13/20	The report has a logical structure with clear sections. However, the writing lacks clarity and is marred by frequent informal language, grammatical errors, and awkward phrasing. The inclusion of figures is attempted, but they are poorly integrated and explained. The flow is occasionally disjointed.
2. Paper Selection & Justification (20 pts)	11/20	The papers are relevant to the broad topic of football analytics. However, the methodology is very weak. The search strategy is vague ("college library," "keywords such as football analytics"), and there is no clear justification for why these specific papers were chosen. The rationale is limited to excluding one paper for being about the wrong sport. The selection appears arbitrary, lacking a systematic approach.
3. Depth & Relevance of Review (20 pts)	12/20	The review provides a descriptive summary of each paper's objectives and basic findings. The content is somewhat relevant, but the depth of analysis is lacking. The coverage of key aspects is partial and often reads like a list of facts from the papers.
4. Critical Analysis & Evaluation (20 pts)	10/20	There is no evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, limitations, or comparative rigor of any of the papers. The review is entirely descriptive. There is no balanced assessment or insightful evaluation of the contributions and limitations of the research presented.
5. Synthesis & Integration (15 pts)	12/15	This is the strongest section. The student makes a clear attempt at synthesis by grouping the papers into two categories: "computer vision and spatial analytics" (Papers 1, 4, 7) and "predictive statistics and comparative modelling" (Papers 2, 3, 5, 6). This shows an ability to identify main patterns across the literature. However, the synthesis does not delve into deeper connections, or conflicts.
6. Academic Rigor &	3/5	Referencing is consistent and well-formatted, which is a positive. The discussion and conclusion primarily re-state the papers'

Criteria	Score	Justification
Originality (5 pts)		findings rather than synthesizing them into new, meaningful insights.

Overall Comments and Feedback

Strengths:

- **Clear Thematic Grouping:** The Discussion section demonstrates a good initial effort to synthesize the literature by categorizing the papers based on their methodological approach (computer vision vs. predictive modelling). This shows an understanding that goes beyond a simple list.
- **Consistent Referencing:** The reference list is well-formatted and consistent.
- **Focused Topic:** The central idea of using data science for a "Money-ball" approach in football is a relevant and interesting topic.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Develop a Critical Voice:** This is the most critical area for improvement. You must move beyond describing what each paper did and begin to critique it. For every paper, ask: What were the limitations of the method? How generalizable are the findings? How does this paper's approach compare to others? Weave this critical perspective throughout your review.
- **Strengthen Methodology and Justification:** Your methodology section must be more rigorous. Explain your search strategy in detail (specific databases, exact keywords, inclusion/exclusion criteria) and, most importantly, justify why you selected the final papers. How do they collectively address your research aim?
- **Improve Academic Writing and Depth:** The writing requires significant proofreading to correct grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and informal language. Furthermore, you need to deepen your analysis by explaining the core methodologies of the papers in a more technical and accurate way, rather than just listing their outcomes.
- **Connect Synthesis to the Core Objective:** While the synthesis is a good start, you need to more explicitly connect these technological categories back to your main goal of "identifying undervalued talent." How does computer vision or an xG model specifically help find undervalued players? Make this practical application the central thread of your discussion.

Final Assessment:

61 points. This literature review identifies a relevant topic and makes a commendable attempt to synthesize the selected papers. However, it is significantly hampered by a lack of critical analysis, a weak and unjustified methodology, and superficial descriptions of the source material. The writing style also requires substantial development to meet academic standards.

Lecturer's Signature: _____ **NB** _____ **Date:** _____ 7/11/2025 _____