

MEMO

TO: Dr. Cecelia Musselman

FROM: Nicole Wojcik

DATE: February 29, 2016

RE: Project 2 – Peer Review – Nathan Hunt

Summary: The paper introduces the topic of implementing fully autonomous driving systems in cars. The paper continues to then speak about the infrastructure, which is broken into three sections: unit, urban, and rural. The unit level section speaks about specifics that the autonomous driving system would need and how modern cars have some of these features already built in. However, there are many other features that modern cars do not have that these new driving systems would need. The urban section speaks about how difficult it would be to drive in urban areas due to the amount of information that would be needed in these systems for them to run smoothly as well as the constant communication that would be needed for the car to perform correctly. The author moves then towards speaking about the rural level in which he states that it would be difficult to communicate between towers because there would be a higher distance between them and the car than in urban environment. Then the paper moves to another new section, levels of autonomy. The author goes into several types of autonomy and explains what each is, starting from full automation and ending with full control. He then moves on to speak about the positive and negatives of having autonomous cars. He explains some examples such as less accidents and more efficiency. The paper ends stating that these cars will become a popular item later down the road because there are a lot of things that still need to happen before they are perfected.

Major Points:

Overall, this paper was very well written and really made its point and ideas very visible. There are no very many errors. However, the few errors that were there do need to be corrected. First, there is no abstract or acknowledgments sections, which the author needs to include. Second, all the citations are missing from the text of the paper as well as the citation style.

Minor Points:

One minor point is that this paper is missing the citation style as well as the word count, which both can be put in a footnote on the bottom of page one instead of making it a header.

This paper should be proof read again because there are some minor grammar mistakes here and there.

Also note which one was the literature review that was being used as a guide due to the fact that most reviews that I have seen do not look like this; therefore once noted, people can see the similarities and notice what writing style the author was trying to go for.