**REHEARSAL of the Elevator Pitch – Peer feedback**

You may copy and paste the criteria below into your email or just use them as a guide on what to watch for and give comments on in written form. Please qualify your opinion! Comments on **why** you said *Yes/No* are essential feedback and far more helpful than *Yes/No* alone.

Name of student pitching: Alexander Pavlyuk

Name of student giving peer feedback: Nguyen Xuan Binh

Yes No

S/he effectively grabbed the attention of the audience at the beginning

of their speech ✓ ☐

*Comment:* He compared the fatality rate between car accident and choking

The main message was clear and logically justified ✓ ☐

*Comment: The main message is to develop a car system that prevents road accidents*

The situation, problem and solution were clearly explained ✓ ☐

*Comment: Yes. They are explained as expected*

The speech was organized effectively and it was easy to follow ☐ ✓

*Comment:* His voice is quite hard to follow. The intonation of many words sounds wrong. I think the only flaw with Alexander’s pitch is his voice. I think he should speak a little slower

His/her delivery was engaging and dynamic ✓ ☐

*Comment:* Not too engaging, but not too bored. I guess his pitch delivery is acceptable

Overall, his/her pitch was convincing ✓ ☐

*Comment:* Yes, car driving system by AI is always a debated topic. His solutions as AI radar and AR head-up display may fix the flaws of previous AI implementations

I would give him/her the requested funding ✓ ☐

*Comment:* Road accidents have been a major problem in all countries, causing painful unnecessary lives. Therefore, I will invest in his requested fund

What could still be improved?

*Comment: Overall, the pitch contents is good. But personally I find it hard to follow. Some parts I cannot even figure out what he said. For Alexander: your pitch would be perfect if you speak slower and clearer. Many parts you glide so fast I cannot hear*