# **ffff - Assignment Feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group Number: 2 | Strengths of the Report | Areas that Need Improving |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First Name | Last Name | ID |
| Alice | Smith | 7381946 |
| Bob | Johnson | 1837265 |
| Charlie | Williams | 9283746 |
| Diana | Brown | 5647382 |
| Eve | Jones | 3748392 |
| Frank | Miller | 8192735 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part A: Automation Conceptual Design** |
| **Topic 1. Product Design (Total: 10 Marks)** |
| The initial product calculations are good but perhaps some additional detail within them would be useful to give a more accurate value. Most components chosen seem reasonable for your design but perhaps the motor is working too close to It’s maximum capacity. It’s good to see the couplings highlighted, however perhaps some additional annotation/highlighting would’ve been useful to better understand your design. The exploded view seems to be missing some annotation for the referencing to a bill of materials which would have been useful to see for all components in the design. |
| It would have been nice to see some attention given to the structural calculations within your design (eg. how it can be held in place during operation). |
| **Part B: Research-Focused Investigation** |
| **Topic 5. Literature Review (Total: 10 marks)** |
| Some good criticism has been given throughout the literature review however it would’ve been nice to see how the research gaps found could be utilised as motivation for your own research. |
| Some of the literature chosen seems to be relevant to the research topic highlighted, however, some aspects could be removed as they seem to offer very little insight into the prior research. Some theories have been identified throughout the literature however it seems that some of them aren’t particularly relevant to your research and may need to be reviewed further. No literature review is given. Custom Feedback |