**Miche Sappia peer review of Ivo’s RDP**

The **introduction** is brief yet introduces the topic sufficiently. The knowledge and statements made are well backed up by sources, however the same source is used 3 times perhaps other sources can be used to further back up arguments.

The **Stakeholder analysis** could use a diagram to make it clearer. You say multiple stakeholders, but only mention 2, perhaps change it to ‘the following stakeholders can be distinguished/identified’ (be more precise with the language and multiple usually means more than 3 generally). Nevertheless the problem owner and the relevance of the 2 stakeholders has been identified.

The **systems description** shows sufficient technical understanding of the content and lays out the basic ideas of the situation. Though only one source is used once again. Neverthe less I believe the technical content is missing (LO4) and could be implemented further in this section.

The **problem statement** is clear and narrows down the scope of the project. The **goal statement** is SMART and hence meets the requirements.

The **research questions** are clear and the link or correlation is clear. Nevertheless, perhaps some explanation regarding why these questions tackle the problem is beneficial.

The **research strategy** sufficiently explains the approach taken in this research project. And the specific approach and goals are made clear.

**Research** section can be improved by discussing the exact resources needed or that will be used for each question.

The **planning**  section can be improved using a gantt chart to ad a visual. However the content is good and clear.
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