

Grading sheet Work Plan final MRWP project

Student Names: Ralfs Brutāns, Giami Huynh & Maria Martin Barbera

Date: 22 May 2024

	weak 0	0.5	sufficient 1	1.5	good 2	+ "bonus" 2.5	feedback
<b>1. Defining Study Topic</b> provides context for research indication of the topic you are going to research indication of knowledge gap					X		The research context is well written and the research gap clear.
<b>2. Initial Research Question</b> focussed describes and refines the issue under study					X		The research question is focused and well written.
<b>3. Model description</b> description of basic model keeping it simple ! potential model extensions			X				The model is sufficiently described. But there are still many details left undefined, e.g., there is no mention of the parameters of the model, or the network(s) that is going to be used.
<b>4. Data collection / experiments</b> what are you going to measure plans for "in silico" experiments		X					Some experiments are explained but there seems to be no real plan on the exact nature of these experiments.
<b>5. Answering Research question</b> Is the intended work plan likely to contribute to answering the research question? Is the connection between the proposed methods and the research question adequately explained and justified?		X					It is not explained in the plan how the proposed experiment will be used to answer the research question.
<b>6. Overall Quality of Work Plan</b> Is the plan feasible, interesting, relevant, manageable, appropriate, systematic?			X				The plan sufficiently well written and the research question is interesting and relevant. The plan lack systematicity on the experimental side.
<b>7. Presentation</b> Is the work plan to-the-point (max 3 pages) Does it use Academic English is it serious				X			The presentation good and the language used is almost always appropriate.

final score = sum/14 \* 100% (NB 100% score is max)