**CG1112 Final Report Peer Review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Writers Team 1 | Team 1 |
| Reviewers Karan Kevin | Team 2 |

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. | ✓ |  |  | Wordy, with very little structure to aid the reader in understanding the content. System architecture is incomplete and basically useless. No point telling me that the pi is connected to the Arduino, obviously what. Design sections are just listing what you intend/have done without showing the reasoning or intention behind each step you take. It is supposed to be a report not a journal. Sections do not start with a purpose statement. |
| 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. |  | ✓ |  | Language is passable, but there are too many abbreviations being used without explanation. Grammarly reports too many errors. Figures and tables can afford to be used more. Too much of a difficulty to read. References should be numbered and referenced to in the report that’s why they are called references. |
| 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. |  | ✓ |  |