Document Similarity Analysis Report

Generated on 2025-03-23 00:10:46

Executive Summary

Overall Similarity Score: 58.58%

Interpretation: The documents have moderate similarity, with significant shared content.

Similarity Visualization



Documents Compared

Property	Document 1	Document 2
Filename	EE5351_L3_4424_UoGSGeW.pdf	EE5351_L2_4424_EzKkxoj.pdf
Word Count	651	518

Similar Content Analysis

All similar phrases found (7 total):

Match 1/7 (100.0% similarity)

Document 1: Observation 6 02.
Document 2: Observation 6 02.

Match 2/7 (100.0% similarity)

Document 1: Calculation 7 03.
Document 2: Calculation 7 03.

Match 3/7 (67.67% similarity)

Document 1: EE 5351 : CONTROL SYSTEMS DESIGN LABORATORY 03 NAME REG No : BALASOORIYA JM : EG/2021/4424 GROUP No ...

Document 2: EE 5351 : CONTROL SYSTEMS DESIGN LABORATORY 02 NAME REG No : BALASOORIYA JM : EG/2021/4424 GROUP No ...

Match 4/7 (65.57% similarity)

Document 1: [2] "Tutorialspoint," [Online].

Document 2: [2] "PID Explained," [Online].

Match 5/7 (64.45% similarity)

Document 1: References 14 01.Observation Figure 1: QUBEServo3 DC motor and load Table 2 : QUBEServo3 parameter T...

Document 2: Reference 13 01.Observation Figure 1: QUBEServo3 DC motor and load Table 2 : QUBEServo3 parameter Te...

Match 6/7 (64.29% similarity)

Document 1: [3] "Control Tutorial," [Online].

Document 2: [3] "Medium," [Online].

Match 7/7 (62.96% similarity)

Document 1: [2] "Tutorialspoint," [Online].

Document 2: [3] "Medium," [Online].

Report Details

Analysis Method: This report uses TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) vectorization and cosine similarity metrics to analyze document similarity. Additionally, sentence-level comparison is performed using sequence matching algorithms.

Interpretation Guide:

- 0-20%: Very low similarity
- 21-40%: Low similarity
- 41-60%: Moderate similarity
- 61-80%: High similarity
- 81-100%: Very high similarity

Disclaimer: This automated similarity analysis provides an approximation of content similarity. The results should be interpreted by a human reviewer for context-appropriate assessment.