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General Feedback:
• There were 195 students who took the exam.
• The average mark for Part 1 is 70% which is similar to the mark of the last year which is 69.3%. Overall, the exam results are largely similar to the last three years when the average marks were between 68-69%.
• 4 or 2% students received a mark of less than 40% (i.e., 7 marks or less). This is much better than 11.7% last year, and is the lowest among 10 years I taught this module.
• 114 or 58.5% 60% students received a mark of 70% or better (i.e., 14 marks or more). This is similar to 60% last year.
• 65 or 33% received a mark between 50% and 69%, (i.e., between 10 and 13 marks) which is better than 20% of the last years.
• 19 or 6.1% received a mark between 40% and 49% (i.e., between 8 and 9 marks) which is a little less than 8% of the last year
• General speaking, the students' performance in Part 1 is very good with the average mark as 70%. What is particular satisfied is that only 2% students failed to pass the exam, which is the lowest failed rate among the last 10 years.

Detailed Feedbacks for Section A:
• Question 1). Almost all students answer this question correctly, except that a small number of students provided the text descriptions rather than an algorithm or Pseudocode required. Further, a small number of students did not specify the number of for loop.
• Question 2). Almost all students answer this question correctly. The common mistake is the calculation error.
• Question 3). The majority of the students answered this question correctly. There are two common mistakes: One is the mathematical formula given is incorrect or incomplete; the other is the required explanation being given incomplete or incorrect.
• Question 4). This is a proof type of question and was designed as a challenge one. As expected, the majority of students were either unable to answer this question or the proof given is incomplete.
• Question 5). The majority of the students know how to answer this question. The common mistakes include that an incorrect formula was used or incorrect reasoning was provided.

Section B
Generally answered very well, the questions involving numerical problems were better answered than those requiring descriptive answers. Mistakes were made mostly in being careless in the a computation: either in not enumerating the sequences correctly, or in miscalculating the products.