**CG1112 Final Report Peer Review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Writers Claire, Evelyn, Aik Peng, Hashir | Team 4 |
| Reviewers Karnati Sai Abhishek, Hong Chuan, Jess Teo | Team 3 |

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. |  |  |  | Intro doesnt relate alex’s ability to map and identify colours to it’s search and rescue functionality.  Well evaluated and described. However could include pics to aid description  can explain more  good job for hardware & software design | |
| 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. |  |  |  | Good job  advisable to remove comments on the side  can have more pictures/figures/diagrams to aid in readability | |
| 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. |  |  |  |