Write your name here: <*Francesco Di Flumeri, Pablo Laso Mielgo*>

**Critically** read the other group’s research plan. Then peer review this research plan answering the questions below. Write your suggestions and comments directly into their research plan or add as annotation to their document. Additionally, add your answers to the questions following each of the questions. Submit this document as well as the marked up research plan. The file name should be of the form:

“*reviewer*-Research\_Plan-Review-YYYYMMDD” (with the date that you submit your peer review and *reviewer* being your name)

Keep in mind that your feedback is very important to each of these other groups; as your feedback will enable them to improve their research plans. Providing and receiving feedback is an essential part of your participation in the course.

<*NOTE: No document was submitted, but just a video file. Our review is therefore based on the video only.*>

Project : <title>

1. Is the document too long/short?

<<The video respects the limit time>>

1. Does the document have a name in the format: “author1\_author2-Task\_1- Research \_Plan-YYYYMMDD”

<<No>>

1. Is there a date in the running header at the top of their report?

<<No date>>

# Project Title:

1. Does the project title reflect the content of the research plan and investigation?

<<Very clearly>>

# Authors

1. Is it clear who the authors?

<<Completely.>>

1. Is there an e-mail address for each of the authors?

<<No.>>

# Aims, Objectives, Goals, Research questions, hypotheses

1. Are the aims, Objectives, goals, research questions, if present hypothesis of the research project appropriate? If not, how can they be improved?

<<Yes>>

# Background and rationale

1. Does the background lead to what is going to be investigated?

<<It does, although we suggest to include some of the results for the readers. To get a more clear picture.>>

1. Is the necessary background knowledge presented? Would this knowledge provide sufficient background for you to carry out the project?

<<It is clear the technique you are to use for this project, although the knowledge is missing.>>

1. Is something missing?

<<Some background theoretical knowledge>>

# Theory/literature

1. Is there a clear theoretical framework or prior research that this research plan builds upon?

<<Yes>>

1. Should something be added or deleted?

<<We think it is quite complete.>>

# Research methodology

1. Has the group described what research method (or methods) will be used?

<<Not clearly>>

1. Has the group argued why this is or these are the most appropriate method or methods?

<<Not clearly>>

1. Should the group use another method? If so, why is this other method more suitable?

<<We assumed they are using an analytical method.>>

1. Is something missing?

<<We think the research method they are going to use could be more clearly explained.>>

# Participants, Procedures, Data collection and analysis

1. If the research requires participants (research subjects, persons to be interviewed, survey participants, …), does the research plan justify the number of participants that are necessary? Have the research plan described how ethical issues will be addressed.

<<Yes. >>

1. Does the research plan adequately describe how the research will be conducted and how & what data is to be collected? Is this data sufficient? Is any of this data unnecessary (i.e. there is no justification for collecting this data)?

<<Yes.>>

1. It software, hardware, or existing data data is necessary is it adequately described (i.e., sufficiently so that you could repeat the data collection and analysis)?

<<Yes>>

1. Does the research plan adequately describe what analysis is to be done using the collected data?

<<Yes, with clear examples!>>

# Expected outcome(s)

1. Does the research plan adequately describe the expected outcomes?

<<Yes, although they could use more papers to give even more details into what the outcome might be (e.g. the accuracy they expect from their models)>>

1. Are the data collection and analysis likely to yield these outcomes?

<<Yes.>>

# Milestones/schedule, budget

1. Is the milestone chart well presented?

<<Yes>>

1. Are the milestones sufficiently detailed?

<<It is very good. You can dig in deeper if you want.>>

1. Are they too detailed?

<<No>>

1. What additional milestones might be needed?

<<Their milestones are mostly related to code. Maybe you could also set some deadlines for you writing.>>

1. What milestones might be removed

<<We do not think there are unnecessary milestones>>

1. Is the time plan viable?

<<Yes>>

1. If there is a budget, is it adequate to carry out the proposed research?

<<There is no budget>>

# Risks

1. Does the research plan describe any risks? If so, are they graded as to the degree of risk? Are there plans for how the research plan should be revised if any of these risks occurs?

<<no risks are mentioned>>

# Outline

1. Is there an outline for the planned research report? If so, is it suitable?

<<No>>

# References

1. Are the references suitable?

<<Yes>>

1. Are there any references that are obviously missing?

<<No>>

1. Are they authoritative?

<<Yes>>

1. Can you find each of them?

<<Yes>>

1. Are the references recent or are they all quite out of date?

<<Yes>>

1. Are the references correctly formatted using a suitable format?

<<Yes, although they could have mentioned the date they accessed the website in number 6 (SGD)>>

# Appendix (Optional)

1. Is the appendix necessary?

<<No appendix>>

1. Is something missing?

<< No appendix >>

# Language –general quality

1. Is the language used in the project plan acceptable?

<<Yes>>

1. Are there problems with the text?

<<None>>

1. Are there parts of the plan that need to be clarified?

<<No>>

1. Is the structure of the plan satisfactory?

<<Yes>>

# Writing

1. Is the language clear? If not, is that because:   
   (a) the authors are reasoning in a way I am not used to?  
   (b) the authors are using words and expressions I do not understand?  
   (c) the text contains grammar or language mistakes which make it hard to follow?

<<It was clear>>

1. Is the writing coherent?   
   (a) Are pronouns used to connect sentences and reinforce meaning?  
   (b) Are logical connectors used?   
   (c) Are paragraphs structured with topic and supporting sentences?  
   (d) Are the subjects of sentences coherent with the topic of the paragraph?   
   (e) Do sentences follow the ‘given-before-new’ rule?

<<Very coherent>>

1. Is the writing concise?   
   (a) Are verbs used instead of nouns where possible?  
   (b) Are words that have little meaning used?

<<Yes>>

1. Are redundant expressions used?

<<No>>

1. Is the writing correct?   
   (a) Are there grammatical mistakes?   
   (b) Are words used correctly?   
   (c) Is punctuation used correctly?

<<Yes>

1. What kind of reader have the writers written for?

<<Mostly any type of reader>>

1. Is the tone of the text: formal, academic, informal, or personal? If so, which.

<<Academic>>

# Other

1. Is the scope of the investigation suitable?

<<Yes>>

1. Is there a reasonable expectation that it can be completed during the course?

<<Yes>>

1. Is the investigation too broad or too narrow?

<<Just right>>

1. Do you have any other comments or suggestions that will help this other group improve their plan?

<<Clarify the research methodology and risks, and write the research plan in a Word>>

1. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the written project plan?

<<Concise, clear, detailed examples. It would be convenient to have a written report, as well as the video>>

# Oral presentation

1. Did the oral presentation match the written research plan? If not, how did it differ?

<<There was no written research plan>>

1. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the oral presentation?

<<Graphical explanations>>

# Overall

1. If you were told that this was to be the plan for your own research, would you be happy or not? Why?

<<Yes, it is very clear and they did a great job overall>>