1. Knowledge and Understanding (25%)

The proposal demonstrates a solid understanding of the required libraries (e.g., spaCy, Transformers, mimetypes, etc.) and their applications. The design process and decisions are clearly laid out with appropriate references to academic literature, such as Carvey & Altheide (2011) and Al Omran & Treude (2017) (Intelligent Agents Grou...). The rationale for choosing a multi-agent system is well-explained, particularly the use of symbolic, reactive, and hybrid agents.

Mark: 20/25

- **Strengths**: Good knowledge of digital forensics and multi-agent systems with references.
- **Improvements**: A more thorough explanation of the challenges of specific library choices and their alternatives could add depth.

2. Application of Knowledge (25%)

Challenges such as the system's potential bottlenecks and latency are well-identified, and the choice of a modular, agent-based approach is justified with literature references like Dorri et al. (2018) (Intelligent Agents Grou...). The proposal discusses how agents interact, providing solutions for potential issues, such as limiting data size.

Mark: 20/25

- **Strengths**: Thoughtful identification of challenges and solid strategies to address them, with clear application of multi-agent system theory.
- **Improvements**: Greater discussion of the trade-offs between accuracy and performance when summarising text files might strengthen this section.

3. Structure and Presentation (25%)

The report is well-organized, with clear sections and appropriate diagrams such as the UML sequence diagram (Fig. 3) (Intelligent Agents Grou...). It appears professional, and the structure makes it easy to follow. However, minor proofreading issues could be improved.

Mark: 18/25

- **Strengths**: Clear structure, logical flow, and appropriate graphical representations.
- **Improvements**: A more thorough proofreading process could eliminate minor typographical errors.

4. Criticality (25%)

The proposal discusses the relative strengths and weaknesses of design decisions, such as the performance overhead and potential risks related to library maintenance (Intelligent Agents Grou...). However, while it acknowledges these issues, the evaluation of alternatives is somewhat limited.

Mark: 18/25

- **Strengths**: Critical reflection on the limitations of the design is evident, especially in relation to system performance and dependency on external libraries.
- **Improvements**: A deeper analysis of alternative methodologies or libraries, beyond spaCy, could enhance the criticality.