Modelling for Combinatorial Optimisation (1DL451) and Part 1 of Constraint Programming (1DL442) Uppsala University – Autumn 2022 Written Opposition - by Team 1:

Andreas JONASSON and Marion DÜBENDORFER

19th October 2022

- Author: Team 11: Alexander Andersson, Savvas Giortsis

- Date: 19.10.2022

- Text title: Modelling for Combinatorial Optimisation (1DL451) and Part 1 of Constraint Programming (1DL442) Uppsala University – Autumn 2022 Report the Project by Team 11 number

- Advisor: Team 1: Andreas Jonasson, Marion Dübendorfer (Students)

Overall impression, context and content

This was good and why

- In our opinion, all relevant facts are included. For the pre-processing of data and outputting individual variables, a plan is outlined.

- In general, the principles learnt in the course are applied and reasoned about mostly correctly.

This could be developed and how

- In the first paragraph, it is stated that all experiments were run on a ThinLinc computer. Later in the report, experiments on a private MacBook are reported as well, so a small inconsistency

How well is the text directed towards the target audience? 4/4
Does the text contain relevant facts to give increased knowledge? 4/4

Structure and disposition

This was good and why

- The report follows the imposed structure of the demo report.

- In general, the report has a red thread starting with the problem introduction, followed by the model, followed by the model evaluation.

This could be developed and how

- For readability, a section where the problem is described could be helpful, instead of having that part in the model section.

- A small section with a conclusion/outlook on the final report would be nice.

- For readability, adding some structure (in the form of comments) to the model could be helpful (e.g. create a section for derived/precomputed parameters, and order constraints thematically).

How well is the text structured and disposed? 3/4

Language and formatting

This was good and why

- In general, the paragraphs follow a clear structure.

- Sentences are constructed in a balanced and varied way, which helps the understanding of technical matters in this report.

This could be developed and how

- A few typos in the report, as well as a few mistakes (e.g., the code snippet on page 6 in the search annotations section is not readable). For the table in the inference annotation section, there is no caption/description and the table is not referenced in the text.

- When reasoning about technical matters, more detailed explanations could be helpful sometimes. For instance, on page 5, in the efficiency section, we don't entirely understand the meaning of the paragraph "The reason for violating the advice..."

- Tables should be placed at the beginning of a page (and referencing them with the ref keyword in the text increases readability))

Is the language good and the format correct? 3/4