

Reviewer: Chen

Reviewee: Alex Anderson

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.	3
Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.)	Readme file is understandable, looking at how things code for using litiengine when it comes to java game design, seems to be set up correctly.				
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.	3
Comments (e.g. Give an	Everything seems fine				

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?)	from a standpoint for the project itself as explained by Alex. But I wonder if there will be a scoring system when it comes to how far you hit the ball each time in game.				
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.	3
Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.)	I don't have much to add since I never worked with litiengine before, but what I have to say is good luck.				