|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant Name | Participant 1 | Participant 1 | Participant 1 |
|  | Charlie | Conor | Ana |
| If a specific area could use more attention, what would it be and why?  Example options:  PCB Design  Fusion 360  Code  Electronics setup | 9/10  The front, there’s a design difference in the LEDs used but other than that it looks grand. | 7/10  The wires don’t jut out of the board which is nice but the extra greblies and aesthetics need to be scaled to probably reduce weight and probably height. | 8/10  For future PCB redesigns the motor pins and switch could be moved to a more convenient place on the board. The fusion360 could use less attention, anything past the current 3d print state would be slight overkill. |
| Does the mouse cover all desired requirements to a descent degree.  Example Options:  Traversal  Visual feedback  Aesthetics  Code | 9/10  It looks amazing and the code is documented very well. I’m not sure if it can solve the maze at this point. | 9/10  The micro mouse moves through the maze quite well and the coding is greatly structured and clearly commented but i think the spoil might be much and might catch on turns. | 6/10  The code could use some work as in the currently the mouse spins no matter the tcrt input. |
| Which component could have a better placement to make the user experience better.  Example Options:  Wheels  LEDS  Pi Pico  TCRT5000’s  Power Switch  Battery | 8/10  The switch could be in a more convenient place for the user | 8/1  The position of the battery could be switched to the bottom of the robot and the TCRT’s on the side should be angled more towards the front for due to cone of vision. The placement of the other components is nice. | 7/10  The switch and the voltage regulator can be swapped around for ease of access. The resistors also seem to be arbitrarily placed on the PCB. |

**Market Testing COMP207 Micro Mouse - Luke Steppens**

**Please score each section out of 10**

Addressing feedback

Question 1. For the first question the responses go over placement of components and the over engineering of the design. These are both valid criticisms. Going forward creating simpler designs will allow for less trouble when unforeseen problems occur, having the components better placed will also work well towards keeping things simple, helping the iterative process.

Question 2. The code is the focus of the feedback for this question. While the TCRT5000's can be a little unpredictable, I have been made aware of ideas that may help that I would like to implement if there is enough time. The main thing would be having the sensors take readings on startup and use those measurements to base the movements upon. Currently they are set to fixed numbers which aren’t always true when it comes to the sensors, this can be due to natural light and shadows.

Question 3. The main point of this piece of feedback were with specific components and their locations, this was mostly covered by my first question. This one adds to it my arbitrary looking placement of my resistors on the PCB. Though it looks arbitrary the placement was based on using the space efficiently for the tracks connecting items. This does still highlight an area that can be improved. Striking a balance between the two rather than focusing on just one would make me better at both in the long run.