

Feedback provider name:

Feedback provider student number:

Feedback recipient name:

Presentation. Clear, legible, structured, use design elements (e.g. media) effectively.

Clarity of writing needs to be improved	Clarity ok, but could be further improved	Excellent clarity of writing
Use of design elements (media / headings) needs to be improved	Ok use of design elements, but could be further improved	Excellent use of design elements
explanation / possibility for improvement:		

- Motivation and research question. What is the central question and why is it important?

Motivation or research questions needs to be improved	Motivation & research questions ok, but could be further improved	Excellent motivation and research questions
explanation / possibility for improvement:		

- Explanation of the algorithms and techniques used. Explained intuitively where possible.

Missing formal description (e.g. algorithm, equation, pseudocode)	Formal description ok but could be improved	Excellent formal description
Missing explanation / intuition	Explanation/intuition ok but could be improved	Excellent explanation / intuition
explanation / possibility for improvement:		

- Experimental design. How & why were experiments set up?

No comparison at all, or major improvement needed	Comparison to baseline, relevancy of baseline or environment not sufficiently clear	Excellent comparison, clear why this environment and baseline was chosen
Single training run on single environment	Multiple runs and/or multiple environments	
Unclear how hyperparameters are chosen and which are used	Clear how hyperparameters are chosen and which are used	
explanation / possibility for improvement:		

- Results and conclusions. Are results clearly presented & conclusions warranted.

Graphs and tables unclear - e.g. no axis labels, or unclear what quantity is shown	Graphs and tables clearly labeled, clear how quantities are calculated
No spread of results shown, or unclear what is shown	Clear indication of reliability of results (including clear definition of what is shown)
Unclear experimental procedure (number of runs, which environments & baseliens)	Clear how experiments were performed)
No conclusions, or not sufficiently supported	Conclusions are sufficiently supported. Strength of conclusion take limitation of experiments into account.
explanation / possibility for improvement:	

- Credit. Clear mention of use of resources (environment, algorithms) by others.

Credit isn't given everywhere where due, or own contribution of group is unclear	Own contribution of group is clear, and credit is given where due
--	---

- Group size

For groups 5: project does not exceed expectations of 4-people groups	Clear additional effort compared to minimal requirements (e.g., more than 2 environments, more than 2 algorithms compared, above average amount of own implementation, ... )
---	--