

## Grading report

Group evaluated: E

Evaluation by (Group, TA, or Prof.):  
Prof, TA, Groups D and F

Module #: 2  
Date: 29/10/25

Prof. Aleksandar Antanasijevic

### **Depth of understanding of the papers' content**

- Excellent understanding of the subject, which is great considering it was a complex, less coherent paper
- Relevant introduction and result elements were presented clearly, but with the primary goal to critically evaluate this work. Given the complexity of the paper, we could have spent a whole day to just understand it. Instead, the group decided to reduce the explanations of small details and focus on evaluation instead. Excellent approach!

### **Level of understanding of the scientific field of the set of papers supported by additional literature search:**

- The scientific context was understood very well and the group was able to comfortably discuss the broader implications of this work – even considering the industrial feasibility.
- The amount of supplementary material was low. It would have been good to provide more references to other similar efforts and/or review papers.
- The critical review was done with knowledge of the peer-review documents, but it was clear that the discussion and critique contained original arguments made by the group.

### **Quality of the presentation (slides):**

- The overall flow and organization were optimal for the audience to follow.
- The slides presented the necessary material. The figures were well placed to understand the state of engineering in this scientific domain.
- Slides were also well organized, with a few minor suggestions for improvement: (1) add slide numbers, (2) check for typos, (3) reduce the content of text.

### **Quality of the presentation (oral):**

- Nicely explained, engaging, interesting... Very good!
- Please avoid hands in pockets while presenting. Work on the body language.

### **Critical analysis, discussion and comparison of the presented set of papers:**

- Overall, the team really understood how to perform a critical evaluation of this paper, with many insightful arguments. One of them was that “the scientific problem may be overstated”. This is quite insightful for the master level students. Well-done Group E!
- The criticism included comparison to other approaches in the field, including also the feasibility for industrial applications.
- The criticism also included the positive aspects of this work, making it well-balanced.

Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

- One minor aspect for improvement: Be careful when switching from positive to negative criticism to avoid directly countering your own arguments. You don't want to talk about something as the "strength" and then say that it is a "weakness" 2 slides later.

**Quality of the answers given in response to the audience questions:**

- Very engaging, long discussion session. The questions were well answered especially considering that the questions asked by the teacher were off-putting.  
- The team clearly demonstrated good background knowledge of the field, but not all the team members participated in the discussion. Something to improve...

**Additional optional comments:**

Keep up with great work!