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| **Research Question** |
| Does the abstract clearly articulate the author’s PhD research question?  The research question is clearly stated as investigating the best approach for processing large volumes of data with minimal energy costs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Clarity** |
| Does the abstract provide a clear overview of what the author will do/has done in order to answer the research question?  A lot of explanation is given for the concepts and technologies behind the research, but the author's contribution is not immediately obvious. It appears to still be in the early stages of the project, with most of the work done thus far being focused on bringing together the large number of technologies (both software and hardware) required for the task, but a clearer description of this would be useful. |
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| --- |
| **Research Contribution** |
| Does the research described provide a novel contribution to research in the author’s field?  No results have been given thus far, so it is too early to assess novel contribution to the field. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Context** |
| Does the abstract cite relevant research?  Citations for relevant technologies and previous research are provided. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Format** |
| Is the abstract correctly formatted as per the guidelines?  The abstract follows the guideline template provided. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other Comments**  Just a few extra comments. As mentioned, a clearer description of the what work has been done thus far would be useful. The RIFF figure is too small to be readable, and could use some extra explanation in either the text or caption. Other than a few grammatical issues, the main body was written well and clearly cited. |