Matrikkel	Rühm	Proj (20)	Comment
98117	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (wrong template / missing headlines) Content: 8/12 (actually well-written but analysed only 2 papers in a 3-person group) - Presentation: 1/5 (was difficult to understand the flow of argument / very little information given / at least one presenter seemed to not know what he was talking about)
A00793	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (wrong template / missing headlines) Content: 8/12 (actually well-written but analysed only 2 papers in a 3-person group) - Presentation: 1/5 (was difficult to understand the flow of argument / very little information given / at least one presenter seemed to not know what he was talking about)
A52925	4. rühm	20,00	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 12/12 - Presentation: 5/5
A62054	4. rühm	16,50	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 10/12 (overall ok but analysis/synthesis a bit too short; forgot to include experiments in the analysis) - presentation: 3.5/5 (ok, but a bit too generic, i.e., no examples no concrete numbers / unclear how th ethree parts relate to each other)
A72027	4. rühm	15,00	Report: Form: 2 (text formatting / missing headlines / list of references partly incomplete) Content: 8/12 (summaries and conclusion ok but too short - could have used the space for showing data and giving examples) - Presentation: 5/5
A73516	4. rühm	6,50	Report: Form: 2.5/3 (no referencing, last sentence on first page incomplete) Content: 6/12 (looked at only 3 papers, although group of 4 / unclear how sub-sections relate to each other, in particular, how to integrate UCM and SUT / How is SUT related to operational profiles and to state-based testing? / Unclear how test case are actually derived from any of the presented techniques) - Penalty: -5 (late submission) - Presentation: 3/5 (little concrete detail given, unclear how test cases are actually derived)
A73560	4. rühm	15,00	Report: Form: 2 (text formatting / missing headlines / list of references partly incomplete) Content: 8/12 (summaries and conclusion ok but too short - could have used the space for showing data and giving examples) - Presentation: 5/5
A73883	4. rühm	16,50	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 10/12 (overall ok but analysis/synthesis a bit too short; forgot to include experiments in the analysis) - presentation: 3.5/5 (ok, but a bit too generic, i.e., no examples no concrete numbers / unclear how th ethree parts relate to each other)
A81902	4. rühm	20,00	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 12/12 - Presentation: 5/5
A82956	4. rühm	16,50	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 10/12 (overall ok but analysis/synthesis a bit too short; forgot to include experiments in the analysis) - presentation: 3.5/5 (ok, but a bit too generic, i.e., no examples no concrete numbers / unclear how th ethree parts relate to each other)

B14246	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (no proper referencing) Content: 6/12 (only 3 papers, although 4-person group / analysis only talks about quality of 'bug reports' but not about bug management / no definition what large-acale SE is and what the typical problems are / text suddenly switches to 'we' and authors seem to talk about their own company and not about what they read in the papers - this is unclear and confusing) - Presentation: 3/5 (unclear what typical problems in LS SE are / unclear what solutions the analysed literature offers)
B31742	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (wrong template / missing headlines) Content: 8/12 (actually well-written but analysed only 2 papers in a 3-person group) - Presentation: 1/5 (was difficult to understand the flow of argument / very little information given / at least on epresenter seemed to not know what he was talking about)
B31743	4. rühm	6,50	Report: Form: 2.5/3 (no referencing, last sentence on first page incomplete) Content: 6/12 (looked at only 3 papers, although group of 4 / unclear how sub-sections relate to each other, in particular, how to integrate UCM and SUT / How is SUT related to operational profiles and to state-based testing? / Unclear how test case are actually derived from any of th epresented techniques) - Penalty: -5 (late submission) - Presentation: 3/5 (little concrete detail given, unclear how test cases are actually derived)
B31744	4. rühm	6,50	Report: Form: 2.5/3 (no referencing, last sentence on first page incomplete) Content: 6/12 (looked at only 3 papers, although group of 4 / unclear how sub-sections relate to each other, in particular, how to integrate UCM and SUT / How is SUT related to operational profiles and to state-based testing? / Unclear how test case are actually derived from any of th epresented techniques) - Penalty: -5 (late submission) - Presentation: 3/5 (little concrete detail given, unclear how test cases are actually derived)
B31745	4. rühm	6,50	Report: Form: 2.5/3 (no referencing, last sentence on first page incomplete) Content: 6/12 (looked at only 3 papers, although group of 4 / unclear how sub-sections relate to each other, in particular, how to integrate UCM and SUT / How is SUT related to operational profiles and to state-based testing? / Unclear how test case are actually derived from any of th epresented techniques) - Penalty: -5 (late submission) - Presentation: 3/5 (little concrete detail given, unclear how test cases are actually derived)
B31746	4. rühm	15,00	Report: Form: 2 (text formatting / missing headlines / list of references partly incomplete) Content: 8/12 (summaries and conclusion ok but too short - could have used the space for showing data and giving examples) - Presentation: 5/5

B31747	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (no proper referencing) Content: 6/12 (only 3 papers, although 4-person group / analysis only talks about quality of 'bug reports' but not about bug management / no definition what large-acale SE is and what the typical problems are / text suddenly switches to 'we' and authors seem to talk about their own company and not about what they read in the papers - this is unclear and confusing) - Presentation: 3/5 (unclear what typical problems in LS SE are / unclear what solutions the analysed literature offers)
B31748	4. rühm	20,00	Report: Form: 3/3 Content: 12/12 - Presentation: 5/5
B31749	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (no proper referencing) Content: 6/12 (only 3 papers, although 4-person group / analysis only talks about quality of 'bug reports' but not about bug management / no definition what large-acale SE is and what the typical problems are / text suddenly switches to 'we' and authors seem to talk about their own company and not about what they read in the papers - this is unclear and confusing) - Presentation: 3/5 (unclear what typical problems in LS SE are / unclear what solutions the analysed literature offers)
B31750	4. rühm	11,00	Report: Form: 2/3 (no proper referencing) Content: 6/12 (only 3 papers, although 4-person group / analysis only talks about quality of 'bug reports' but not about bug management / no definition what large-acale SE is and what the typical problems are / text suddenly switches to 'we' and authors seem to talk about their own company and not about what they read in the papers - this is unclear and confusing) - Presentation: 3/5 (unclear what typical problems in LS SE are / unclear what solutions the analysed literature offers)