

Feedback provider name: Hidde Jessen
Feedback provider student number: 11810912
Feedback recipient name: Howard Caulfield

Instructions:

Take some time to read the other group's report or blog (about 30-45 minutes). After that, use this feedback form to note your comments.

For each criterium (row), make clear which of the options apply, by e.g. underlining it or marking it in color. For each section, explain in a couple of sentences why you have given the rating, and what the other group could do to improve on those aspects.

75 minutes after the start of the tutorial session (12:15 or 14:15), get back together in the breakout room to share your feedback. You might both take 5-10 minutes to read the feedback, and then ask each other for additional explanation if something is still unclear. In addition to sharing the feedback with the other person, upload a PDF version of this form in Canvas.

- Presentation. Clear, legible, structured, use design elements (e.g. media) effectively.

Clarity of writing needs to be improved	Clarity ok, but could be further improved	Excellent clarity of writing
Use of design elements (media / headings) needs to be improved	Ok use of design elements, but could be further improved	Excellent use of design elements

explanation / possibility for improvement:

The report is something between a blog post and a paper
It has the clear structure and design of ~~a~~ a paper but the informal writing of a blog

- Use less formal headers
- More color/visualizations
- Clearer distinction between method and experiment

- Motivation and research question. What is the central question and why is it important?

Motivation or research questions need to be improved	Motivation & research questions ok, but could be improved further	Excellent motivation and research questions
--	---	---

explanation / possibility for improvement:

very clear in the introduction

- Results and conclusion. Are results clearly presented & conclusions warranted.

Graphs and tables unclear - e.g. no axis labels, or unclear what quantity is shown	Graphs and tables clearly labeled, clear how quantities are calculated
No spread of results shown, or unclear what is shown	Clear indication of reliability of results (including clear definition of what is shown)
Unclear experimental procedure (number of runs, which environments & baselines)	Clear how experiments were performed clear how hyperparameters are chosen and which are use
No conclusions, or not sufficiently supported	Conclusions are sufficiently supported. Strength of conclusions take limitation of experiments into account.

explanation / possibility for improvement:

more description for the figures
add the rest of the results

- Credit. Clear mention of use of resources (environment, algorithms) by others.

Credit is not given everywhere where due, of own contribution of group is unclear.	Own contribution is clear, and credit is given where due.
--	---

explanation / possibility for improvement:

todo

- Group size

For groups of 5: project does not exceed expectations of 4-people groups	Clear additional effort compared to minimal requirements (e.g. more than 2 environments, more than 2 algorithms compared, above average amount of own implementation)
--	---

explanation / possibility for improvement:

- Other feedback (optional)

- Explanation of the algorithm and techniques used. Explained intuitively where possible.

Missing formal description (e.g. algorithm, equation, pseudocode)	Formal description ok but could be improved	Excellent formal description
Missing explanation/intuition	Explanation/intuition ok but could be improved	Excellent explanation / intuition.

explanation / possibility for improvement:

DQN part shows both in formulas as in writing what the difference is

- Experimental design. How and why were experiments set up?

No comparison at all, or major improvement needed	Comparison to baseline, relevancy of baseline or environment not sufficiently clear	Excellent comparison, clear why this environment and baseline was chosen
single training run on single environment	multiple runs and/or multiple environments	
unclear how hyperparameters are chosen and which are used	clear how hyperparameters are chosen and which are used	

explanation / possibility for improvement:

I don't think I would be able to reproduce the experiments from this description

Maybe make a short overview of what you have done / how you have done it

Some results in the experiment section, move to section 4 (for example that you obtained similar results)
maybe an existing baseline would be nice