Q1. Average mark: 8.9/20 (44.5%), STDDEV 4.3. As the average shows, this question was disappointingly answered. This surprised me, since I had thought the question was on the easy side.

Part (a) was generally well-answered, and was the easiest part.

Part (b) was poorly answered. Diagrams were needed here, but many students had poor or non-existent diagrams. The part about "distinction between branches and leaves" was designed to make you think -- and overall the answers here were less than inspiring.

Part (c) implied that you needed some geometry before rendering it, but about half the students ignored this.

Part (d) was, on the whole, reasonably answered.

Q2. Average mark: 13.7/20 (68.6%), STDDEV 3.1. As the average shows, this question was well-answered, and in retrospect the level of difficulty here was clearly on the low side.

Part (a) asked you for your own analysis, and about 2/3 of the class were to make sensible observations here.

Part (b) was easy bookwork, and almost everyone got full, or almost full, marks. Some people answered this part without diagrams, which is not very sensible.

Part (c) (i) and (ii), again, were almost universally correctly answered. For part (iii), however, there was huge variation. A number of people talked about feature extraction methods other than Canny/SIFT/SUSAN, which implies to me that Wikipedia has been consulted.

Fair enough, but marks were not generally available for topics not taught, but name-checked without any explanation.

Part (d) was the least-well answered part of the question. About 1/2 the class did not "compare and contrast" as the question asked. Instead, they explained how laser scanning works, and then explained (in many cases repeating their answers from part (c)) how image-based geometry extraction works. There was little reflection and analysis.

Q3 This was generally well answered; perhaps the weakest part was that where the question asked for the relationship between the rendering technique and the rendering equation, what was often given were general comments about whether or not the technique generates photorealistic results.

Q4 Generally well answered but marks were often thrown away by not putting the description of the algorithm in each section into the context given by the question.