

**Bhavyan.pdf:**

3.0/5.0 – Pro: Simple, uses the same relative format of all messages  
Con: Document too lengthy, could combine I'm alive messages with others to ensure information is current.

**Broda.prd:**

2.0/5.0 – Pro: Very specific about command line formatting.  
Con: Document too lengthy/wordy, no specific description of the format used to transmit messages.

**Dube.pdf:**

3.0/5.0 – Pro: Lots of graphics that illustrate how their protocol works  
Con: Document excessively lengthy, and repeats much information that was given to us and doesn't specify anything new.

**Dugan.pdf:**

5.0/5.0 - Pro: Very clear representation of how the protocol messages are structured along with concise description of how each is supposed to work.  
Con: None

**Hwang.pdf:**

4.0/5.0 – Pro: Concise and shows how the messages are formatted with a good description of the interaction.  
Con: Due to the random acceptance of neighbors, servers could end up with no neighbors.

**Jindal.pdf:**

5.0/5.0 – Pro: Clear structure and great examples provided.  
Con: A bit lengthy

**Nitin.pdf:**

1.5/5.0 – Pro: Utilizes preexisting protocols  
Con: Utilizes preexisting protocols, contains excessive information that should already be known to protocol users, no firm clear structure of the protocol.

**Pearson.pdf:**

4.0/5.0 – Pro: Clear structuring, good descriptions and specificity.  
Con: Numerous commands. Perhaps they could combine a few and put parameters.

**Perez.pdf:**

3.5/5.0 – Pro: Consistent message formatting  
Con: lengthy document.

**Reza.pdf:**

3.0/5.0 – Pro: Not bad...  
Con: Tries making fake connections adding overhead and some messages in protocol are too complex.

**Ritu.pdf:**

3.0/5.0 – Pro: Each message type specification provided.  
Con: Organization lacking.

**Ritwik.pdf:**

4.0/5.0 – Pro: Multiple things can be communicated with one message  
Con: Lots of parameters to parse

**Rohin.pdf:**

2.5/5.0 – Pro: ...  
Con: Not all functionality covered

**Roncek.pdf:**

3.0/5.0 – Pro: Simple and clear  
Con: may miss something

**Tapasvi.pdf:**

4.0/5.0 – Pro: Each part or message of the protocol clearly defined  
Con: ...

**Vaishnav.pdf:**

4.0/5.0 – Pro: Not bad  
Con: You may not know which server or client the error originated.\_

Note: I did not grade my own submission. If you would like me to do so, please let me know.