Assignment 1, step two out of three

This assignment is done in *three parts. For this part, you will work alone*. The only persons you can ask for help are the instructor, lab assistant, and library tutor. Anyone else is a non-authorized collaboration, that is, an act of academic dishonesty. If you have any doubt or question about what qualifies as academic dishonesty, please contact the instructor to make an informed decision.

Objective: Computer science is an art, a craft, and a science. We make choices, and they should be analyzed (given best practices), compared to alternatives, and corrected when applicable.

Due date: Sunday Sept 30th, 9pm.

How to submit: On the course website only (no emails or hardcopies accepted).
Send a single PDF document named "Firstname_Lastname_Review1.pdf"
Do include your first name (only) at the top of your document.
(The person you review will ultimately meet you, but you don't know who you review.)

I. Overview

In part one, everyone worked on five problems (including one that they made up). For each one, they argued how it should be modelled (CA vs ABM), how the model works (in sufficient details so we could code it if knew NetLogo very well), and provided a figure showing the initial state. In part two, you were given the work of another student, and you have to review the solution proposed to each of the five problems.

II. Structure

Create five sections in your document, that correspond respectively to problems 1 to 5 in the student's work you were given. For each section, create the following subsections:

• *Model choice*. *If you made the same modelling choice* as the student (in your own assignment 1 part 1), then write (i) which of the student's arguments are essential to justify this choice, and (ii) whether other arguments can justify this choice but haven't been mentioned by the student.
If you chose the other type of model (e.g., the student argues for CA but you argued for ABM), then (i) list the arguments that you agree on, and (ii) write a convincing piece in favor of your arguments when they disagree with the student's.
For the fifth problem created by the student, think of how you'd approach it yourself.

• *Model description*. Assume that the student's choice of modelling approach is correct. Examine the description of their model and (i) if anything is missing, list the main element that most prevents the description from being comprehensive; (ii) if anything can be simplified, provide the main simplification you would make; (iii) if anything is wrong, highlight the main change that is needed.

Refrain from commenting on a student's style. For example, we are not interested in copy editing: don't fix a student's grammar or spelling. We are interested in the model analysis. It may happen that the student provides an unclear description of the problem they created. If this lack of clarity gets in the way of conducting the tasks above, you can state how you are *interpreting* the student's original description (i.e., what assumptions you have to make).

Your review will be passed onto the student, and you will physically be meeting to discuss each other's review. While you should **be courteous**, you're not trying to be *nice*: you want to **be rigorous, fair, and clear**. For example, if the student had something really wrong in a model, but instead of fixing it (per 'Model description'-iii above) you chose something much less significant, your review will be judged as being of lower quality.