**Comments**

### General Comments

Many answers failed to provide sufficient information -- where questions asked for, for example 4-5 sentences, too many answers consisted of 1-2. Many answers were poorly written. Answers often repeated irrelevant phrases verbatim from lecture slides.

### Q19 (Linked Data)

Overall, answered rather poorly. Some answers considered the wrong principle (i.e what happens if a source doesn’t include links). Some “justification” as to whether it can play a part was expected, for example discussing the extra burden that non-standard formats may place on clients, or a lack of consistency in interpretation.

### Q20 (OWL API)

This question was answered badly. Few answers provided much in the way of design. There was also confusion about the role that reasoning would play in such an application. Some answers just talked about applications in general or irrelevant details.

### Q21 (SKOS)

Answered well in general. Most answered covered the lack of formal semantics and transitivity and referred to application usage.

### Q22 (SKOS and OWL)

Few answers succeeded in really *discussing* the issues here. The question here was not about OWL and SKOS being different, but about the use of OWL as the metamodel to define SKOS.

### Q23 (Patterns)

Few answers managed to sketch out the use of SEP triples correctly. For many answers, the issue was not identifying the use of an appropriate existential quantification. Also, few examples attempted to describe what the SEP pattern was.

### Q24 (PIMPS)

Answered well.

### Q25 (Closure)

Most answers formulated the expression correctly, but many failed to provide an *axiom*.

### Q26 (Normalisation)

Reasonable answers here, although a number ended up discussing the processes through which they would arrive at the answer, which was not asked for.

### Q27 (Axiomatisation)

For this question, the expected answer was a simple axiom expressing the fact that SugarBeet participates in Processing. Many answers attempted to encode the entire scenario.