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**SWOT ANALYSIS:**

**FYP FIELD: Artificial Inteligence/Machine Learning**

**Group Mates: Muzamal Ali and Hudabia Faiz**

**Muzamal Ali:**

**STRENGTHS:**

* Exceptional Programming Skills
* Good background in Machine Learning
* Always determined

**WEAKNESSES:**

* He can work in a team but prefers to work alone
* Has not worked on App development
* Values people’s opinions too much

**OPPORTUNITIES:**

* Enroll in every machine learning course he can.
* Seminars
* Internships (ML related)

**THREATS:**

* High Workload
* More competition due to high number of ML Projects

**Hudabia Faiz:**

**STRENGTHS:**

* Very good at hardware design
* Charismatic and easy to work with
* Very Social
* Great Communication skills
* Always determined
* She makes the work environment fun and enjoyable

**WEAKNESSES:**

* Worries too much
* Values people’s opinions too much
* Cares about other’s problems more than her own problems

**OPPORTUNITIES:**

* Enroll in every machine learning course she can.
* Seminars
* Internships (ML related)

**THREATS:**

* High Workload
* More competition due to high number of ML Projects

**Q4:**

The CV provided gives this person a very good chance of getting hired. But I would not hire him that quickly. While his CV covers all his technical background, it gives very little or no information about his personality. One of the requirements of the job is that the person should be good in written and oral communication but in the CV provided, there is nothing that checks this mark. Other than that he has a very strong CV, he has worked in multiple high tech companies which will portray an impressive image of the organization outside while dealing with other organizations/partners. A very good educational background also gives him an edge. He says he is “client focused and willing to travel extensively” which is something we want from him. He is a team player, has strong problem solving skills and Project management skills, all add up to a good CV but again I’m not too sure about his written and oral communication. He has not even mentioned his name or contact info in his CV which shows his lack of written communication. So I would not hire him for this position. Or maybe have a meeting with him before I decide on hiring him because it is a very prestigious position and I must be very careful about it.

(220 Words).

**Q3:**

**Summary**

EESKA invited some of the editors of the most important journals in order to answers some questions that will improve the quality of the research papers. Each of the editor answered each question independently to give a broader view of the different perspective. Every editor agreed that the tile of the research paper is very important and it should be short and “eye catching”. The abstract should be sharp and should basically cover everything in short. The methods used shall not be faulty. Introduction section needs not to be more than 4 lines and it should mention how the information provided will be useful. About the best order of methods our editors had different opinions but it was concluded that IRB approval, patients, methods, measurement methods and then statistics is the best order. The accuracy of measurement techniques and the reliability and reproducibility must be clarified in the methods and results. The statistical methods that make a paper unacceptable is if the corrections lead to a different result. The result of the paper should comprise of Very complete tables with the most important results pointed out in the text. The discussion section needs to have most important findings, Clinical relevance of these findings, How and why these findings agree or dis-agree with existing literature, Limitations of the study honestly described and Factual conclusions. If someone is not happy with the review of a paper, they should discuss with the editor politely about it. About the limitations of a study, every study has some limitations, so the author should be honest about his study and mention all the limitations. The editors also agreed that the quantity and quality of the studies is improving regardless of their origin and that we should accept the best studies, wherever they originate.

This interesting collection of answers has given us different points of view. It is not easy for a young researcher to put together all the numerous pieces that make up a good paper and we hope that this interview may have clarified the ideas and given some tricks.