Group Number: 28 - food recommendations		
Student #1:	**Student #2:**	**Student #3:**
Lauren Kersten	Atakan Tekparmak	Melisa Samancioglu

Joost	Ludi
System *- Technical quality (incl. 'debugging', verification)* *- Use of knowledge technology. Separation declarative knowledge and procedural model.* *- Functionality, user interface.* *- Expert validation of represented knowledge.* UI looks good, but falls apart in the results screen, where results are presented in an unformatted way, sometimes even looking like a code or logic statement “-(spaghetti, bolognese)”. Question depth seems quite limited and options also still seems quite over the place or unspecific. “Buffet” can still mean anything. I got “burger” under a vegetarian menu. Of course, you can have vegetarian patties or even offer both vegetarian and non-vegetarian options together, but then your system should be specific about that. Answers could use a lot more text to elaborate. I also feel like a party menu would never be as limited as presented here. Usually you do not have one drink type, you have a few! In short, I think there is a lot of potential here not being used.	**System** *- Technical quality (incl. 'debugging', verification)* *- Use of knowledge technology. Separation declarative knowledge and procedural model.* *- Functionality, user interface.* *- Expert validation of represented knowledge.* No expert validation. A few runs shows some incoherent results (selecting italian cuisine results in being recommended tacos, german + winter + outdoor + vegan resulted in no main dish). Lots of prolog warnings when running the app. All prolog predicates are one-place, seems very inefficient. There are some rules for matching to exclude dairy and nut allergies. User interface looks okay - the survey part.
Report *-Description of how the system works. Problem solving model, domain model, rule model. Walkthrough.* *-Assessment of role of knowledge technology (strengths and limitations).* *-Description of design process. Knowledge acquisition process. Justification of design choices (incl. delimitation).*	**Report** *-Description of how the system works. Problem solving model, domain model, rule model. Walkthrough.* *-Assessment of role of knowledge technology (strengths and limitations).* *-Description of design process. Knowledge acquisition process. Justification of design choices (incl. delimitation).*

-Clarity, structure, language. RKT does not go into what knowledge tech is nor what the domain is, so talking about how the two go together is very abstract. Knowledge models is very implementation focused, but is not actually the knowledge models. I am missing especially the PSM, there is a brief attempt at a rule model. Validation is way too shallow and brief, and I am having trouble believing the expert is that excited about this. Reflection reveals to me that the focus was very much on the technical implementation of the system, but that may be the least significant components for this course.	*-Clarity, structure, language.* Use of KT section is unclear- what do you mean by "since the system does not always actually know which items belong together, it has the ability to think outside of the box with combinations in ways that people would perhaps be weary of", since this seems like a contradiction. No clear discussion of limitations, no elaboration on which rules are "obvious", or why food-pairings are typically rule-based (I can think of a few: fish and white wine etc.). Knowledge models are not knowledge models, but description of prolog code. Also the technical problems that you ran into are important, but shouldn't be a large part of the design sections. User interface section is okay? Validation section mentions only "no big technical errors" but nothing about the quality of the inference, the results of the knowledge system. Reflection does not talk about the obvious limitations
Presentation It sounded quite scripted. You also went into too much technical detail, the file structure is not relevant for the presentation.	**Presentation**
Extras *- Overall impression.* *- Bonus features.* Seems underdeveloped. There was a lot more potential in the domain, but a focus that was too heavily on implementation makes it hard to judge how much they actually did. A repair track, in order to at least write the correct knowledge models and a more in-depth validation, and perhaps clean up the results page of the system, may be appropriate.	**Extras** *- Overall impression.* *- Bonus features.* I think that there is potential for a good system - you implemented rules about food restrictions, which is a good first step. However, it is too limited at the moment.

Grade:	5