



Opposition template

About group: F

by: Tomáš Homolka

Product

Handheld Electric Mixer



Key strengths

Key strengths

- *What was well executed?*
 - *Report is very clearly and nicely structured. All the methodologies were given a quick intro. Well arranged tables and calculations.*
- *Did the group show particular innovation or creativity? How?*
 - *While the methodology followed standard practice, the creativity shown in the 3D model of the workstation and production line layout was commendable.*
- *Were the chosen methodologies appropriate for the objectives?*
 - *Chosen methodologies were aligned with the structure of the course therefore appropriate for the objective.*
- *Were technical justifications for design choices strong and well-supported?*
 - *While section 3.5.2. offered valid technical suggestions, more detailed explanations would help readers unfamiliar with the product understand the rationale better.*
 - *One suggestion referenced disassembly, which is not typically within the scope of DFA. While related, disassembly is usually addressed through Design for Disassembly (DfD), so its inclusion felt slightly out of place here.*
- *Does the report suggest effective coordination and teamwork?*
 - *The consistent tone, equal representation of sections, and smooth transitions suggest that the team collaborated effectively.*

Areas for improvement

Areas for improvement

- Are there technical issues or missing information? (e.g., unrealistic assumptions, incomplete data)
 - The report lacks sufficient references to support key calculations, particularly for demand estimation and cost analysis. Most sources cited relate only to machinery and equipment, leaving gaps in the justification of numerical assumptions.
- Are practical aspects properly addressed? (e.g., feasibility, implementation constraints)
 - Practical aspects were well addressed, including feasibility and constraints related to implementation. Could have included some space requirements and worker paths in the workstation design.
- Are there gaps in explanation or reasoning? (e.g., weak justification, missing steps)
 - The main gap I noticed was in section 3.5.2, where the DFA suggestions lacked sufficient justification. A more detailed explanation would improve the reader's understanding of the proposed design changes.
- Is any part of the report unclear, ambiguous, or difficult to follow?
 - The report is well-structured, with logical flow and clear explanations, making it easy to follow throughout.
- Are there weak arguments that need stronger evidence/references?
 - Many assumptions made throughout the report—particularly related to demand forecasting and cost estimations—lack references or evidence. Including data sources would strengthen the credibility of the arguments.

Assessment of implementation and results

Assessment of implementation and results

- *Is there sufficient documentation of the process?*
 - *Documentation of the process is very thorough and clear.*
- *Are the results/data valid and based on reliable sources?*
 - The results appear reasonable and consistent with expectations; however, no sources are cited to support the data, which weakens the credibility of the analysis. Referencing data sources would improve transparency and reliability.
- *Are the explanations logically structured and easy to follow?*
 - *Yes, explanations are logically structured and easy to follow.*
- *How complete is the work? Are any key aspects missing/weak?*
 - The work appears complete and well-rounded. All major elements of the project are addressed, and no significant gaps are evident in the analysis or conclusions.
- *Did the group consider alternative approaches or compare different solutions?*
 - The group effectively considered three different line balancing methods and provided a comparative analysis, which adds depth to the decision-making process and shows critical evaluation of alternatives.

Report and presentation

Report and presentation

- *Is the report structured logically and easy to follow?*
 - *The report is structured logically and is easy to follow. Each section transitions smoothly into the next, maintaining a coherent narrative throughout.*
- *Does the report cover all necessary information concisely?*
 - *The report covers all necessary information concisely. Key topics are addressed clearly without unnecessary detail, making the content informative.*
- *Is there a logical flow of ideas and sections?*
 - *There is a strong logical flow of ideas and sections. The organization reflects a clear understanding of the project stages, guiding the reader from objectives to conclusions seamlessly.*
- *Are figures, tables, and diagrams effectively used to support arguments?*
 - *Figures, tables, and diagrams are effectively used to support arguments. Visual elements are well-integrated and enhance the clarity of the explanations, providing strong support for the analysis.*
- *Does the presentation effectively communicate the key aspects of the project?*
 - *The presentation effectively communicates the key aspects of the project. The main ideas are clearly highlighted, and the format ensures that important points are easy to grasp.*

Questions for discussion and suggestions

List 2-4 questions to discuss during opposition

1. How did you validate the assumptions made in your demand and cost calculations?
2. Is there any part of your solution that you would improve or approach differently with more time?

Provide constructive recommendations

- Include more references and data sources to strengthen the validity of calculations and assumptions, especially for demand forecasts and cost estimations.
- Expand on the technical justifications for design decisions, particularly in sections like DFA suggestions, to make the reasoning more accessible to readers unfamiliar with the product.

- Overall, the project report is well-executed, clearly structured, and demonstrates a solid understanding of the relevant methodologies. The team presented a logical flow of ideas, used visuals effectively, and addressed the practical aspects of the project thoroughly. While a few areas could be improved, the work reflects strong coordination and thoughtful analysis.

