

<i>Description</i>	<i>Deduction</i>
General issues: Spelling and grammar	0.025
Writing style	0.025
Heat map: No difference in width/height of the cells	0.25
CCFinder: Imprecise discussion of the type of clones that CCFinder can identify. CCFinder cannot identify Type 1 clones correctly as such due to, e.g., normalization.	0.1
Wrong or unsupported statement	0.25
Question	0.1
General issues: Capitalization.	0.025
The conclusions section is missing. However, since this has not been formally required in the assignment, no points will be deducted.	0
General issues: Bibliography and references	0.05
General: Capitalize classes of numbered objects: "As shown in Figure 1", "In Section 2 we discuss", etc.	0.05
Workflow: No normalization	0.25
Heat map: The choice of the same color for the lowest comparison value and for the lack of comparison in the upper triangle is confusing: it suggests that duplication between, say versions A and B, is different from duplication between versions B and A. You should have either presented a symmetric picture or grayed out the upper rectangle.	0.75
Heat map: Quality of the fonts in the axes labels (versions) should be improved.	0.25
Document organization	0.05
Workflow: RNR filtering applied to files rather than to clone data (Livieri et al. "the Repeated Token Ratio (RNR) metrics has been used to perform a filtering of the code clone data")	0.75
Tool: No discussion of how the minimal clone size is set.	0.25
Discussion of the evolution: No discussion of reengineering activities	0.35
Insufficient discussion of major releases. At least the move from Azureus to Vuze should have been discussed.	0.3



