**Feedback of Group 5 from Ruth Estefany Quispe Pilco**

Scientific overview:

1. Is any part of the scientific background unclear or confusing? If so, what additional information would be helpful?

They did a good job explaining the importance of the localization of the RNA to keep the functions and stability. Also, I understood why they will use the technique of fluorescent microscopy and the tools they will use for modifications, as the aptamers in order to see a good performance at the localization experiment.

1. What part of the project do you find interesting?

I found interesting the use of Riboglow probe and also how they will join the methods in a same pipeline and how they address the possible errors. Of course the errors will appear at the moment they are processing the pipeline, but take into advance those, will be very helpful.

Architecture:

1. What components of the groups’ proposed architecture do you think is a good design?

I think that have the frames of input and output is the first good step, then separate the feed of the data It is also a good way to work. Overall it is good as a big panorama, but still need to be more specific in the use of the functions they will used.

1. What, if any, are some limitations of the current proposed architecture that you see?

I think the possible limitations could be the functions that they are not specifying to be use because if any extension or library needs aditional requirements, the architecture will change at some point. However, it is something that it is possible for any project at the beginning.

1. What components of the architecture do you think might be missing?

I think the general aspect is ok but for a defined specific architecture, it could be good to consider some possible interfaces for outputs or for objects (those defined in the main file).

Technical Implementation:

1. Do the proposed data types seem suitable for the proposed software design? If not, what could the group improve?

Yes, those are suitable. In fact, they present a good preprocessing description, so in that sense, the input are qualified to start the proposed processing.

1. Do you anticipate any computational bottlenecks not described by the group?

No, but as I said it before, recognize the functions and the objects will help a lot in the implementation of the processing steps.

1. Does the delineation of the code development between developers make sense or do you anticipate any code conflicts when merging the code? Does an alternative division of labor seem more suitable?

I think they will start doing the implementation of the code soon. After that, We can do any recommendation.