UG Exam Performance Feedback
Third Year
2018/2019 Semester 2

COMP38120 Documents, Services and Data on the Web

Sandra Sampaio
Goran Nenadic
Riza Batista-Navarro

Comments

Section A
Q1. The average for this question was 59%. Part (a) was generally well answered, with only few students referring to the alphabetical order (incorrect); in some cases the marks were lost if the answer was left ambiguous by not specifying what was aimed to be optimized. Part (b) was OK, although several answers failed to discuss the role of the weight in the retrieval – it wasn't enough only to provide a formula! Part (c) worked well, with the majority of students providing the right answer and working; in few cases there were no explanations of the steps (just numbers in the graph), and marks were lost there; part (c.ii) was also generally well answered. Part (d) was bookwork and surprising only few relevant answers were provided; no marks were earned for discussions on precision and recall. Part (e.i) was straightforward (although some answers also discussed potential for a navigational query); part (e.ii) required the students to think outside the content provided during the lectures; while there were interesting discussions, there were only few that combined different aspects, e.g. temporal markers from the query itself and the user's behavior log (what they usually look for); there were also generic, unrelated and unrealistic answers on why temporal information might be important – these did not get the full marks.

Section B
Overall, the marks were quite good. The only element that most students struggled to answer was an application of technique question that involved a case study, item (b). And this was because it required a bit of thought before answering, and it was probably the case that most students answered the first thing that came to the mind.

Section C
(a)This (bookwork) question was answered correctly by majority of the students.
(b)This (bookwork) question was answered correctly by majority of the students. Students who were simply guessing (e.g., saying that Vocabulary Links are for linking vocabularies) were not given full marks.
(c)This question requires the analysis of some data in RDF and was answered well by majority of the students. Those who were not given full marks made the common mistake of not representing the triple AlmondMilk--rdfs:label-->"almond milk" in the graph.
(d)i. This question was answered well by almost all students.
ii. This question was not answered sufficiently by many students. While almost all students knew how to use the subPropertyOf predicate, many did not demonstrate correctly the use of the domain predicate.
(e)Almost all students provided a satisfactory answer to this question. A common mistake amongst students who did not receive full marks comes from the confusion that the regex function of SPARQL that was called in the given query, performs exact string matching (whereas it only requires that a string contains "son").