

The peer review assigned to me gives me a “404” error when I try and view it. Instead, I reviewed @aaronchen451 project.

| Category | Full Marks (3 Points) | Partial Credit (2 Points) | Partial Credit (1 Points) | No Marks (0 Points) | Score |
|---|---|--|---|--|-------|
| Quality of Work | Work (e.g., code) looks correct and organized. The project's readme file is clear, intelligible, and give a good idea of what the project is about. | Work (e.g., code) looks mostly correct and organized. The code could be better structured. OR the project readme file is somewhat unclear. | Work (e.g., code) is mostly disorganized. OR the project readme file is very unclear. | No code is given. | |
| Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.) | The work in the repository is very neat and organized well. | | | | |
| Intellectual Merit | The project looks interesting, creative, and/or substantial. | The project is interesting, creative, and/or substantial, but does not seem feasible to do in a semester. | The project lacks substantial complexity. | No code is given or the project description is too vague to determine if the research has merit. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. If the project is too complex, what parts of the project could feasibly be done? If the project is too simple, what features could be added?) | This project looks very interesting and I think it would cool to try it out when you complete it. | | | | |
| Video | The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project. | The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project, but is confusing or vague in parts. | The video does not give a helpful, clear depiction of the project. | The video is missing or is inappropriate. | |
| Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.) | The video gives an overview of what the goal is and the steps to accomplish it. Very good! | | | | |

I receive the same error again so I did my second review for @SamanthaHarms14.

| Category | Full Marks (3 Points) | Partial Credit (2 Points) | Partial Credit (1 Points) | No Marks (0 Points) | Score |
|---|---|--|---|--|-------|
| Quality of Work | Work (e.g., code) looks correct and organized. The project's readme file is clear, intelligible, and give a good idea of what the project is about. | Work (e.g., code) looks mostly correct and organized. The code could be better structured. OR the project readme file is somewhat unclear. | Work (e.g., code) is mostly disorganized. OR the project readme file is very unclear. | No code is given. | |
| Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.) | The work is organized and it's easy to find certain files within the repository. | | | | |
| Intellectual Merit | The project looks interesting, creative, and/or substantial. | The project is interesting, creative, and/or substantial, but does not seem feasible to do in a semester. | The project lacks substantial complexity. | No code is given or the project description is too vague to determine if the research has merit. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. If the project is too complex, what parts of the project could feasibly be done? If the project is too simple, what features could be added?) | The project looks very interesting and the concept of it is very creative. | | | | |
| Video | The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project. | The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project, but is confusing or vague in parts. | The video does not give a helpful, clear depiction of the project. | The video is missing or is inappropriate. | |
| Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.) | I could not see the video but that is a common issue. | | | | |