Project Report Evaluation Criteria

Evaluating a course project report is similar to reviewing a conference paper. Therefore, I will grade all reports myself and apply the **qualitative criteria** commonly used in conference paper reviews. Submissions will be placed into distinct categories based on their overall quality. For this course, I will use the following five categories:

- **Super (95):** The report presents a comprehensive simulation study of the chosen problem, includes thorough performance evaluation, and provides well-supported discussions and conclusions. Its technical merit is comparable to—or close to—that of a publishable research paper.
- **Excellent (90):** The report contains a solid simulation investigation and provides good, though not fully in-depth, performance evaluation. The discussions and conclusions are clear and well-reasoned.
- **Good (85):** The report includes all essential components of a simulation study and provides basic evaluation results, but the analysis or discussion lacks depth or is not sufficiently developed.
- **Borderline (80):** The report is missing some necessary components of a simulation study—for example, failing to explore key system parameters or failing to compute confidence intervals.
- **Lacking (75 or lower):** The report omits critical elements, such as constructing an input model, explaining simulation results, or discussing fundamental design choices.

Common Problems to Avoid (Incomplete List)

- Missing calculation of confidence intervals in the performance evaluation.
- Not using the CRN method when comparing different methods or scenarios.
- No explanation of the main flow or logic of the simulation.
- Possible simulation bugs, suggested by results such as:
  1. different methods producing nearly identical performance when they clearly should differ;
  2. performance remaining unchanged under significantly different parameter settings;
  3. unusually large confidence intervals;
  4. results that are difficult to interpret or show no clear performance trends.

- Not following the "**Guideline for Writing Report**," resulting in missing components such as summaries of results or explanations of parameter settings.
- Significant writing issues, such as poor organization or excessive grammatical errors.
- Overuse of ChatGPT or similar tools in writing. While you may use such tools for polishing, you must revise and proofread your report to avoid the recognizable "GPT writing style" (e.g., overly fancy vocabulary, redundant phrasing, and heavy use of "-ing" clauses).