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| **Criteria** | **Rating** | | | **Comments and Suggestions** |
|  | **☺** | **😐** | **☹** | **Content and Organisation** |
| 1. Introduction presents the problem that Alex is designed to tackle. | ✓ |  |  | This report clearly shows the strengths and weaknesses in the review of the state of the art which is commendable. |
| 2. Two tele-operated S&R robotic platforms are described and evaluated. | ✓ |  |  |
| 3. Diagram clearly illustrates the high-level system architecture. | ✓ |  |  |
| 4-6. Design sections are complete and technically accurate. | ✓ |  |  |
| 7. Conclusion describes mistakes and lessons learned. | ✓ |  |  |
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