

Name: André Daniel Alves Gomes		[Bold face indicates the text chosen to evaluate the criteria]		Weight	Grade for criteria
Criteria/Grade range	90-100	70-90	50-70		
Relevance and originality of the theme and thesis	The theme is extremely relevant and up to date. The thesis is quite original, raising unsuspected controversial points.	The theme is relevant and mainstream. The thesis raises good discussion points, some of them unexpected.	The theme is moderately relevant. A clear thesis is not evident or is too weak.	15%	75%
Relevance and quality of the bibliography	Excellent use of evidence to support arguments/points. Substantial evidence of independent research.	Good use of evidence to support arguments. Some evidence of independent research.	Fair use of evidence to support arguments. No evidence of independent research.	15%	80%
Ability to evaluate critically and construct arguments	Very high standard of critical analysis using appropriate conceptual framework. Clear evidence of independent thought. Arguments clearly structured and logically developed.	High standard of critical analysis using appropriate conceptual framework. Arguments mostly well structured and logically developed.	Uses an appropriate conceptual framework. Arguments reasonably clear but undeveloped, without a clear line of thought.	30%	60%
Use of the RE concepts	Remarkable mastering of the RE concepts. Precise use of the RE concepts to support arguments.	Very good use of the RE concepts. Adequate use of the RE concepts in most of the argumentation.	Reasonable use of the RE concepts. Little or no use of the RE concepts in the argumentation.	30%	75%
Structure and clarity of writing	Excellent writing. Flawless structuring of the essay.	Very good writing. Good structuring of the essay.	Good or fair writing. The structure of the essay is not completely clear, and sometimes is confusing.	10%	80%
Total					72%

Additional notes:

The topic of the essay is relevant and interesting for an argumentation. Although a thesis can be envisioned after reading the essay (ML requirements engineering is substantially different from source code requirements engineering), this is not explicit and the essay is limited to the description of NFR related with ML systems, without really addressing the thesis. Furthermore, the essay is too short to achieve a satisfying argumentation.