

## Problem 1

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Summary Sheet: Interpretation of the Problem</b>	Clear background, mentions the big problem to be solved and specifies focus areas of the paper; easy to locate and is consistent throughout the paper <i>(5 points)</i>	Restates the problem, some goals are mentioned and consistently followed <i>(3 points)</i>	Problem not stated or hard to find <i>(1 point)</i>	4.5/5
<b>Summary Sheet: Overview of Methods</b>	Indicates methodologies used, as well as their purposes in a chronological fashion; easy to understand <i>(10 points)</i>	Methods stated, but are unclear and difficult to understand <i>(6 points)</i>	Methods barely or not mentioned with no explanations given <i>(1 points)</i>	8.5/10
<b>Summary Sheet: Statement of Conclusions</b>	Main results included with analysis and assessment of the model(s) mentioned <i>(10 points)</i>	Results included, but not clear and/or too technical <i>(6 points)</i>	Few or no results, analysis, and assessment <i>(1 points)</i>	8/10
<b>Solution: Assumptions/Justifications</b>	Assumptions are well justified and limitations are stated when appropriate; all major assumptions are included and consistently followed <i>(5 points)</i>	Some major assumptions are missing, unreasonable, or not flowed <i>(3 points)</i>	Most major assumptions are left out, unreasonable, or not followed <i>(1 point)</i>	4.5/5
<b>Solution: Variables and Parameters</b>	Identifies important factors in the model and their influences on the outcome; numbers are clearly cited if appropriate	Factors are mentioned but sometimes introduced without sufficient reasoning	Factors are poorly chosen or numbers are not well cited	3/5

	<b>(5 points)</b>	<b>(3 points)</b>	<b>(1 points)</b>	
<b>Solution: Usage of Method(s)</b>	Method(s) are used correctly, efficiently, and effectively for solving the problem; consistently followed without significant errors  <b>(25 points)</b>	Method(s) are used correctly but are inefficient for solving the problem  <b>(15 points)</b>	Method(s) are incorrectly utilized or involve major errors  <b>(1 points)</b>	16/25
<b>Solution: Explanation</b>	Detailed, accurate, and concise explanations with words and math; conclusions are easily accessible and answers the problem statement  <b>(20 points)</b>	Presentation is somewhat detailed, accurate, and concise; the original problem statement is answered  <b>(12 points)</b>	Vague and long winded, or the original problem statement is not answered  <b>(1 points)</b>	14/20
<b>Solution: Analysis and Assessment</b>	Analyzes the viability of the model. For example, how it responds to change in parameters? Possible weaknesses?  <b>(10 points)</b>	Some analysis is included, but not well justified  <b>(6 points)</b>	Insufficient or incorrect analysis is presented  <b>(1 point)</b>	8/10
<b>Format</b>	0-1 criteria missing from the following: - Length does not exceed 35 pages - References are clearly represented and sources are correctly cited - Formulas and graphs are plainly labeled - Paper is enjoyable to read - Appropriate grammar and font used - File type (PDF)  <b>(10 points)</b>	2-3 formatting criteria missing  <b>(6 points)</b>	More than 3 formatting criteria missing  <b>(1 point)</b>	9/10

<b>Total</b>	Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- don't need to include all the assumptions in your summary</li> <li>- too many grammar errors making your summary hard to follow</li> <li>- why do you introduce cosine similarity twice?</li> <li>- since many of your quotes are matched with person 1, try some alternative method that allows you to minimize the overall distance</li> <li>- if you are not using Manhattan distance or Mahalanobis distance, there's no need to introduce them</li> <li>- T1 and T2 were first introduced as the matching rate but were later used to denote something else</li> <li>- explanation for algorithm 2 is confusing and some of the dimensions don't match</li> <li>- would be better if numerical examples were shown for sensitivity analysis</li> </ul>	75.5/100
--------------	--	----------

## Problem 2

<i>Criteria</i>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<i>Points</i>
<b>Summary Sheet: Interpretation of the Problem</b>	Clear background, mentions the big problem to be solved and specifies focus areas of the paper; easy to locate and is consistent throughout the paper <i>(5 points)</i>	Restates the problem, some goals are mentioned and consistently followed <i>(3 points)</i>	Problem not stated or hard to find <i>(1 point)</i>	4/5
<b>Summary Sheet: Overview of Methods</b>	Indicates methodologies used, as well as their purposes in a chronological fashion; easy to understand <i>(10 points)</i>	Methods stated, but are unclear and difficult to understand <i>(6 points)</i>	Methods barely or not mentioned with no explanations given <i>(1 points)</i>	10/10
<b>Summary Sheet: Statement of Conclusions</b>	Main results included with analysis and assessment of the model(s) mentioned <i>(10 points)</i>	Results included, but not clear and/or too technical <i>(6 points)</i>	Few or no results, analysis, and assessment <i>(1 points)</i>	7.5/10

<b>Solution: Assumptions/ Justifications</b>	<p>Assumptions are well justified and limitations are stated when appropriate; all major assumptions are included and consistently followed</p> <p><i>(5 points)</i></p>	<p>Some major assumptions are missing, unreasonable, or not flowed</p> <p><i>(3 points)</i></p>	<p>Most major assumptions are left out, unreasonable, or not followed</p> <p><i>(1 point)</i></p>	<p>3.5/5</p>
<b>Solution: Variables and Parameters</b>	<p>Identifies important factors in the model and their influences on the outcome; numbers are clearly cited if appropriate</p> <p><i>(5 points)</i></p>	<p>Factors are mentioned but sometimes introduced without sufficient reasoning</p> <p><i>(3 points)</i></p>	<p>Factors are poorly chosen or numbers are not well cited</p> <p><i>(1 points)</i></p>	<p>4.5/5</p>
<b>Solution: Usage of Method(s)</b>	<p>Method(s) are used correctly, efficiently, and effectively for solving the problem; consistently followed without significant errors</p> <p><i>(25 points)</i></p>	<p>Method(s) are used correctly but are inefficient for solving the problem</p> <p><i>(15 points)</i></p>	<p>Method(s) are incorrectly utilized or involve major errors</p> <p><i>(1 points)</i></p>	<p>14/25</p>
<b>Solution: Explanation</b>	<p>Detailed, accurate, and concise explanations with words and math; conclusions are easily accessible and answers the problem statement</p> <p><i>(20 points)</i></p>	<p>Presentation is somewhat detailed, accurate, and concise; the original problem statement is answered</p> <p><i>(12 points)</i></p>	<p>Vague and long winded, or the original problem statement is not answered</p> <p><i>(1 points)</i></p>	<p>14/20</p>
<b>Solution: Analysis and Assessment</b>	<p>Analyzes the viability of the model. For example, how it responds to change in parameters? Possible weaknesses?</p> <p><i>(10 points)</i></p>	<p>Some analysis is included, but not well justified</p> <p><i>(6 points)</i></p>	<p>Insufficient or incorrect analysis is presented</p> <p><i>(1 point)</i></p>	<p>5/10</p>

<b>Format</b>	0-1 criteria missing from the following: - Length does not exceed 35 pages - References are clearly represented and sources are correctly cited - Formulas and graphs are plainly labeled - Paper is enjoyable to read - Appropriate grammar and font used - File type (PDF)  <i>(10 points)</i>	2-3 formatting criteria missing   <i>(6 points)</i>	More than 3 formatting criteria missing   <i>(1 point)</i>	8/10
<b>Total</b>	Comments: - in addition to your interpretation of the problem, you should also mention what the problem is in your summary - your assumption 2 says the impact of payment type is minimal but why is the price function still depended on payment type?			70.5/100