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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. |  | ✓ |  | There is no explicit mention on the problem that needs to be tackled. However, it can be implied from the explanation of Alex regarding the objectives.  The group is able to concisely describe and explain the functionalities of Alex. Evaluation of state-of-the-art technologies can be observed and explained accordingly.  The diagram is detailed and yet able to be easily understood with adequate explanation complementing the diagram.  The hardware section does not go into the details of the design and is not complete.  The division of the software, firmware, and user functionalities makes the flow of explanation clear to the reader.  Some sections have an overview statement, while the more technical sections go straight into the content. |
| 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. | ✓ |  |  | There are no obvious grammatical or spelling mistakes  The style of the text is academic but not unnecessarily complex  The figure in section 3 is not labelled, but everything else is good.  The report is formatted in a clear manner.  There is in-text referencing. But maybe too much reference to the same number [4].  Referencing is IEEE  There is a redundancy near Figure 1: the humanoid robot is written twice, once above the picture, and once below. |
| 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. | ✓ |  |  |