Evaluation Criteria and Score Breakdown

1. Knowledge and Understanding (25%)

Strengths:

- The project demonstrates a strong grasp of intelligent agents, AI-driven analytics, and fitness tracking.
- Good use of digital forensics principles applied to fitness data management.
- The discussion on MAS and AI-driven anomaly detection models is well-explained.

Areas for Improvement:

- Some concepts, like AI model selection (Isolation Forest & One-Class SVM), could be further expanded with a clearer rationale for their selection over alternatives.
- More discussion on **real-world application** or comparison with existing solutions would strengthen the justification.

2. Application of Knowledge (25%) - Score: 21/25

Strengths:

- The MAS approach effectively distributes tasks across specialized agents.
- System security considerations (encryption, API token management, etc.) are well thought out.
- Challenges are identified, and appropriate mitigations are proposed.

Areas for Improvement:

- The discussion on **data validation risks** could include examples of false positives and how they are handled.
- A deeper **technical exploration** of edge computing constraints and trade-offs would strengthen the practical application section.

3. Structure and Presentation (25%)

Strengths:

- The document is well-organized with clear sections, proper academic formatting, and a logical flow.

- Technical concepts are explained concisely without excessive jargon.

✗ Areas for Improvement:

- **Figure captions and explanations** could be clearer. The sequence diagram description, for instance, could provide more details on how failure cases are handled.
- Some minor typographical errors (e.g., "API MQTT MQTT" in Software & Library Requirements).

4. Criticality and Justification (25%)

Strengths:

- The report evaluates strengths and weaknesses of major design decisions.
- Security risks and API limitations are well-analyzed.

Areas for Improvement:

- A stronger critique of alternative methodologies (e.g., why not a centralized database vs. MAS?) would improve critical analysis.
- More discussion on **limitations and potential trade-offs** of using a cloud-edge hybrid model.

This is a **strong and well-developed report**, demonstrating technical and theoretical competence. Improving the depth of justifications and critical comparisons with alternative solutions would push it closer to an **excellent (90%+) distinction level**.