

MAJOR PROJECT - Final Report – 55%

Student Name:	Evan Smith
Title of Project:	Image Processing: An Iteration in Augmented Reality
Supervisor:	Andrew Baker
2nd marker:	Gordon Dickers
Course:	Games
Project Type:	~~Survey~~ ~~Review~~ ~~Experiment~~ Development (please circle)

	Mark %
<u>First Marker's General Comments and Original Mark</u> A fairly good effort has been made here. Some practical issues identified in respect to the coding of the various algorithms. This has had a negative effect on the final results achievable through this project. Overall, a good effort.	52.5
<u>Second Marker's General Comments and Original Mark</u>	48.5
<u>Comment After Consultation With Other Marker & Final Agreed Mark</u>	51

Signature: Date:

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
1. Research-informed Literature				
Introduction	/5	/5	/5	2.5/5
Literature Review	/20	/35	/20	8/15
Comments: The introduction failed to provide a broad overview of the topic being researched. Rather, it was simply a definition of the term AR. Lit Review – historical context for AR described in too much detail. Includes a comprehensive look at the various AR SDK's available along with the various practical applications of AR in industry. However, much of the background research undertaken should have been edited-out of the final report or reduced considerably in volume, to allow for more detailed research on specific topics relevant to solving the given problem – i.e. the practical application of edge detection algorithms used in AR. Two case studies have also been included to compare variations on the Sobol approach.				
	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject				
Methodology	/5	/5	/5	2.5/5
Survey Design	/15	-	-	-
Requirements/Design	-	-	-	2.5/5

Comments:

Research Methodologies outlined with some discussion. Text-book approach taken here to discuss various methods. Very little linkage to the problem at hand, size of development team etc.

Brief set of requirements identified – basically load image, apply filter, display image

Design Methodology identified to support the requirements – again this feels a little bit superficial.

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
3. Analysis				
Results & Discussions	/25	/25	/25	14/25
Conclusions and Recommendations	/10	/10	/10	5/10
Comments: An attempt made to generate both quantitative and qualitative data. Some success here. All data graphed accordingly with some analysis of the results undertaken. Qualitative assessment of Robinson and Sobel implementations undertaken using off-the-shelf software application Some general conclusion and recommendations identified – but these sections are rather light in substance.				
	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
4. Practical Application and Deployment				
Development	-	-	-	7/15
Experimental Design	-	-	/15	-
Comments: Both algorithms have been successfully implemented using an off-the-shelf AR library. Comparative tests conducted, and some reasonable conclusions drawn. Unfortunately, Evan had a minimal amount of success in developing his own code using OpenGL and a .bmp loader. It is thought that this is due in part to the broad-brush approach taken when undertaking the literature review – i.e. not enough in-depth research undertaken to fully understand all aspects required to tackle this project.				

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
5. Skills for Professional Practice				
Reflection	/10	/10	/10	5/10
Quality of Report	/10	/10	/10	6/10
Comments: A fair reflection of the personal strengths and weaknesses encountered. Identified aspect of the project that did not go as well as hoped, with suggestions for future attempts identified. Good quality references used throughout the document. The presentation of the document is clear and well structured				
TOTAL:	/100	/100	/100	52.5/100

