

**Group 1: Biland and di Vincenzo**

Format: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- everything ok</li></ul>	5	/ 5
Title and abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- suitable title; the abstract is ok, but it could focus more on comparable research, not only on initiatives; appropriate keyword;</li></ul>	2	/ 2.5
Background: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the background section is informative and introduces relevant context; the research gap could have been explained more explicitly.</li></ul>	2	/ 2.5
Research goal and objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the objectives are a bit general (for example, which propositions do you suggest to reduce flight-related emissions?)</li></ul>	2	/ 2.5
Data and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the methods for preprocessing are fine, but you could provide more details here and there (which APIs did you use?) and omit irrelevant details (e.g. delete "To create accurate and meaningful recommendations for reducing flight emissions at the MNF", you always want to be accurate and meaningful); the methods for the actual analysis are vague (how do you use R to examine the effect of flight classes on emissions?)</li></ul>	2.75	/ 3.75
Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the preliminary results are interesting, meaningful and correspond to the research objectives; the presentation could be improved</li></ul>	3.25	/ 3.75
Impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- good explanation of the potential impact</li></ul>	2.5	/ 2.5
Overall quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the structure is ok; the language is a bit verbose and could be improved here and there; some aspects are explained well, others can be improved</li></ul>	1.5	/ 2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	