

Evolutionary Algorithms: Peer review report

For the group of Other group member 1, Other group member 2, and Other group member 3

Group Member 1, Group Member 2, and Group Member 3

October 28, 2025

Formal requirements

Please respect the structure of this template. You can remove the instructions in this section from your report. The blue text should be replaced with your discussion. Your report can be at most 2 pages long.

It is recommended that you use this L^AT_EX template, but you are allowed to reproduce it with the same structure in a WYSIWYG-editor. You should replace the blue text with your discussion. The questions we ask in blue are there to help you decide which topics to discuss, rather than an exact list of questions that must be answered.

This peer review report should be uploaded to Toledo by November 17, 2025 at 9:00 CET. It must be in the **Portable Document Format** (pdf) and must be named r0123456_peerreviewX.pdf, where r0123456 should be replaced with your student number and X with either 1 or 2. Each group member should hand it in individually on Toledo.

Your report will be given to the other group and you will in turn receive the feedback of two other groups. You can use this feedback to improve your evolutionary algorithm in the individual phase.

1 One strong aspect

Identify one strong aspect of the proposed evolutionary algorithm that should certainly be kept or further strengthened in the final solution. Explain why you believe it is a strong point.

2 Two weak aspects

Identify two weaker points of the design. Explain the reasoning why you think these are weak points—try to convince the other team you are right. Note that you should not explain *how* to solve these issues, you are only required to identify them.

2.1 Specific aspect 1

Explain the first weak point here. Replace the title with something informative, like “Too selective elimination operator.”

2.2 Specific aspect 2

Explain the second weak point here.

3 A genAI hint

Offer one concrete genAI hint that could have improved the implementation generation process employed by the other group. Explain how your trick could have improved the outcomes.