


Grade	71.00 / 100.00
Graded on	Wednesday, 29 November 2017, 2:28 PM
Graded by	 Ioannis Benardis



General Comments

- Proofreading could help with language issues and word choices at places. Perhaps a colleague could help with that.
- Perhaps the introduction could contextualise smart spaces a bit more thoroughly. (e.g. which ubicomp technologies help create a smart space?)
- A very good introduction section nevertheless, especially the part that shows the scope of this paper and provides rationale.

Originality 17/25

- Section 1.2 could again provide a link to the two types of spaces that are going to be described in the paper. That would show the author's analysis skills as well as their ability to synthesise elements from different sources to provide a fresh view to the topic.
- In section 2 it is nice that the author shows their personal stance in regard to the topic. However, the argumentation process should provide more on the comparison of the two types of smart spaces.

Rigour 19/25

- The section on applications of smart spaces and their domains is very thorough and descriptive with very good support from academic sources. It is broad enough to cover all categories and the level of detail is very relevant. It would be an improvement if the domains were explored in relation to physical and transient spaces. That would balance the report towards the topic a bit.
- Challenges of smart spaces are discussed as an argument towards physical smart spaces. In a more rigorous approach, the advantages of smart spaces (regarding both sides) should be discussed to provide balance and then a discussion upon both would help provide a more informed stance for the author. If the applications are meant to be the positive side of smart spaces this needs to be more clear to the reader.

Clarity 18/25

- Perhaps try to avoid having too many bullet-point lists. Some of them could be transformed into paragraphs that describe them more coherently. This especially when describing the items later on anyway.
- Linking words and phrases could help link the different sections of the report conceptually so that is more fluent and easy to follow.

Significance 17/25

- The use of examples is appreciated since they provide a better understanding of the concepts described. Perhaps the author could provide examples that show their personal reasoning.
- While into 1.1 the requirements are presented nicely, it would be an improvement if the author critically evaluated them against the two categories of physical/transient smart spaces and potential differentiation that they could have.
- A discussion section that would combine the information presented and argue upon that with the critical stance of the author would provide a good contribution to this paper. The author provides their point of view on not replacing physical smart spaces but that is not supported adequately.

Overall 71/100

- A very good report that shows a good understanding of the topic described. While the author showcases instances of individual arguments the essay could provide more links and discussion to the two types of smart spaces that would offer more original and significant insights on the topic. While the expression could be improved the message was always conveyed and the structure of essay was clear enough.