Titelei

Projektgruppe	GangGreen
Teilnehmer	7
Titel	A systematical approach on regulating and reducing e-waste

Cover Sheet

Document Identifier	yes
Version History	yes
Project Acronym	No, group name taken
Project Title	yes
List of all authors	yes
Corresponding Author	(yes)

Layout

Number of Pages (10)	10
Correct Format	yes

Content

Abstract	yes
References	yes
Related Work	yes
Methodology	(yes)
Evaluation	no
Achievements	yes
Introduction	yes
Description of Research	yes
Conclusion	no
Future Work	yes
Deviation from Proposal	no

Remarks

- General remarks:
  - The LMU is „Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität“ (with „s“)
  - Always have a space between text and reference number (some text [n] and not some text[n])
- Introduction: The introduction is very short. It would be helpful if you back it up by statistical numbers like worldwide e-waste or e-waste by country or something like that. This gets the reader a feeling for the dimensions of the problem. You present these number later but here would be the better place.
  At the end oft he introduction you should make the methodology more explicit by forward referencing the forthcoming sections (similar to „in section 2 we …, in section 3 ..“).
  NEVER use phrases like „Due to practical constraints, this paper cannot provide a comprehensive review …“ because this creates the perception that you were not able to set the context correctly. Instead, narrow your problem statement.

- Related Work: When quoting [11] do not use double quotation marks (like "‘) and when quoting [14] do not use quotation marks at all. You need a reference for Larry Summers. Do not use bold expressions on page 3. The two bullets on page 3 should be integrated as running text.
  At the end of section 2.1 you have a problem as there is neither a reference to the four procedures, nor is there a deduction of your approaches. You must introduce them and explain why these are important and why these are the „correct ones“.
  When you first mention EWSI you need to expand it to E-Waste Systems Inc. and you should refer to their home page (as foot note).
  Be careful with evaluations. Your phrase „EWSI offers the highest standards in data security.“ is an evaluation. How do you know? Did you measure it?
  In the related work section you need to position related work against your requirements. In other words, tell the reader in more details what is good (and why) and what is missing. Because this is your justification to do something different.
- Ingredient List: A mock-up or example picture would be helpful. Even better would have been a UML class diagram which would make the list specification a lot more precise than the vague text description of now.
- Applications: Table 2 is a bit blurred and I do not understand the caption of table 2. Table 3 is a figure and not a table. If this is not your figure you need to acknowledge the source. In addition, all tables and figures must be referenced in the text.
- Problems: Rename „Problems“ to „Challenges“, sounds more positive.
- You do not have a conclusion. However, it is good practice (and therefore nearly mandatory) to conclude a scientfic work. The conclusion would also be a good place to put your section 7 into.
- References: [1] is wrong as it has an author (Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft), [2] dito, in [4] is the author Deutsche Umwelthilfe and not DUH, in [5] is the author the European Union, in [9] is the author Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V. and not NABU
- There are some typos and „slang-like“ words in the text:
  - P1: „in this paper we proposed …“
  - P2: „isn’t“ should read „is not“
  - P2: „european“ should read „European“
  - P4: What is „aĂlJbottle bill,aĂİ“
  - P8: What is „companyâĂŹs“
- There is no section describing your deviations from the proposal.
- General impression: The paper is very good. Please try to remember the above remarks for your future work. Especially, be careful with references and readability. Also, invest enough time and space for the development of your requirements and for the system design. For your paper a formal UML design approach would have been reasonable.