Constructive Criticism

* More distinguished headings would be nice (different font sizes, **bolds**, something more than just underlining), just formatting itself.
* Address issues with other solutions, but no talks of implementation issues of own solution
  + so much talk about why it’s useful but never the feasibility of the implementation
* Last mile transportation is a problem that usually only applies to shipping goods long distancesk
* Mention walking and owning a bike in intro, these are very common esp. In urban areas
* Abstract should only be one paragraph, more condensed; intro contains info that belongs in lit review
* IEEE
* Many times you say “this is well supported” or “arguably” or “pre-existing sources” with no sources cited.
* Page 8, initial survey not cited??? What is this?-
* Navigation section is too long. Has mini sections that should be separated.
  + should be split into local navigation and global
* Simulation should be its own subsection
* Low amount of definitions

Good things:

* Flows well and is very well-written overall
* Sensing section is very in-depth and well written with the different sensors being justified
* Great use of research, lots of citations that aren’t redundant
* In general, there’s a lot of brief definitions that aid in the understanding of the points
* “We plan to implement more classes such as sidewalks or road hazards since the bike may be traveling on an obstructed road, like a college campus with a lot of construction.” is a sick burn