We are (team members' names):

Clark, Sonawani,Lakshminarayanan

Team - 1

Abhinav Karthik Sridhar

Venkata Sai Charan Motupalli

Sanjay Reddy Arikatla

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Easy to understand				
Thorough coverage of Q-learning	X			
Good organization of slides		X		
Just the right length		X		
References cited when needed*				X
Slides are well prepared, not too busy/spotty	x			
Good sketches/visuals/illustrations	x			
Good use of numerical examples (small eg that can hand compute)		x		
TOTAL SCORE**	22			

Team - 2

Jerrin Jose

Charanjit Nayyar

Shreyas K Venkataramanaiah

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Easy to understand		X		
Thorough coverage of Q-learning		X		
Good organization of slides	X			
Just the right length	X			
References cited when needed*	X			
Slides are well prepared, not too busy/spotty	X			
Good sketches/visuals/illustrations		X		
Good use of numerical examples (small eg that can hand compute)		X		
TOTAL SCORE**	28			

Team - 3

Zachary Drummond

Joshua Paige

Adam Zbinden

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Easy to understand				X
Thorough coverage of Q-learning			X	
Good organization of slides				X
Just the right length				X
References cited when needed*		X		
Slides are well prepared, not too busy/spotty				X

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Good sketches/visuals/illustrations				X
Good use of numerical examples (small eg that can hand compute)				X

	TOTAL SCORE**	11

Team - 4
Hanzhang Wang

Shibin Zheng

Bin Dong

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Easy to understand	X			
Thorough coverage of Q-learning			X	
Good organization of slides	X			
Just the right length		X		
References cited when needed*				X
Slides are well prepared, not too busy/spotty	X			
Good sketches/visuals/illustrations	X			
Good use of numerical examples (small eg that can hand compute)				X

	TOTAL SCORE**	23

Team - 5
Sai Prajwal Kotamraju

Rakshith Subramanyam

Sai Pratyusha Gutti

criteria \ scores	4	3	2	1
Easy to understand	X			
Thorough coverage of Q-learning	X			
Good organization of slides	X			
Just the right length	X			
References cited when needed*	X			
Slides are well prepared, not too busy/spotty	X			
Good sketches/visuals/illustrations	X			
Good use of numerical examples (small eg that can hand compute)	X			

	TOTAL SCORE**	32

* Properly mention which reference you used (specifically page number and equation number, etc…).
  Make sure to cite all references use at the end of the ppt.
** higher score means better work

comments
Some slides are too words and text is in unprofessional font.
Do not cite any of the pictures or examples.
Too many examples.

comments
Lost of words and not many diagrams, hard to picture what you are saying sometimes.
Lite on application.
Pretty good length
Little wordy
Not many visuals

comments
Not easy to understand at all.
Almost no coverage of applications or how it actually works.
Poor organization.
Way to short.
There is so little real information that it seems the information that is there is well cited.
Poorly prepared. Very poorly.

No visuals at all.
No examples at all.

comments
Easy to understand what is there.
Not great coverage of application process.
little short.
No references at all and some images were copied from other sources with no reference.
No numerical examples.

comments
Excelent