Opposition report: Comparative study on road and lane detection in mixed criticality systems

Emil Hjelm

June 13, 2017

The report is well written, interesting and quite enjoyable to read with not too many typos. The author definitely succeeds in interesting the reader in the topic and the author seems motivated by the task.

The report is well structured with a clear goal. There is a clear direction and the different sections are well connected with each other. The background study built up the required knowledge to solve the engineering problem and answer the research question. There are clear links in the implementation part to the background study. The background study is of appropriate magnitude.

The figures and tables used were of good quality and provided helpful information.

The general formatting of the report was good.

The work undertaken during the project achieves its purpose and goals and the report reflects very well the engineering work.

The gathering of results and general approach was scientific and systematic. The methods used were consciously chosen. (Gathering execution times of parts of the algorithm, system identification etc.)

The thesis seems to be of high value to the larger research project and the commissioner.

The author has not really contributed something new in their chosen field. (But that's asking for a lot, no?)

The topic area is of great interest. Both in industry, but it also seems to fascinate people outside of the engineering field.

The purpose is clearly described.

It is not entirely clear how the author will address the issue of "mixed criticality" from the beginning, all other issues are clearly described.

The author has quite clear boundaries, one boundary needs to be remade though: "Constrained to the Xilinx Zynq-7000". Since the Raspberry Pi was used, this boundary is not kept.

The author has used solid references. They are presented in a very consistent manner at all times references are needed.

The author has made multiple suggestions for future work for its employer, all of which are good continuations on the authors work.

One thing I feel could be added is an comparison between different algorithms in the implementation. Comparison is made in the literature study, but it would have been interesting to see some differences between different algorithms in the implementation.