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Rate each component of the poster on a 3-point scale: **☺** = Great, **😐** = Average, and **☹** = Needs Improvement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Rating** | | | **Comments and Suggestions** |
|  | **☺** | **😐** | **☹** | **Content and Organisation** |
| 1. Introduction presents the problem that Alex is designed to tackle. |  | ✓ |  | 1. Cool firemen related goal, but might be good to include project requirements as well.  2. Lack of citations. Should include the source and purpose for the context. No purpose in providing the state of the art.  3. Might be good to use the standard UML diagram since the format is already decided.  4. Might be good to provide more in-depth descriptions of hardware components  -  -  -  Try to include an overview of what is going to be explained. |
| 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. |  | ✓ |  |
| Sections start with a purpose sentence or overview statement. | ✓ |  |  |
|  |  | | | **Language and Mechanics** |
| Grammar and spelling are accurate. |  | ✓ |  |  |
| The style (register) is appropriately academic. |  | ✓ |  |
| Figures, tables and pictures are properly labelled and referred to in the text. |  | ✓ |  |
| The report’s overall appearance is reader-friendly. |  | ✓ |  |
| IEEE referencing conventions have been followed. | ✓ |  |  |