

PIONEER PROJECT PEER REVIEW FORM

Reviewer: Lakshya Rajoria
Student Reviewed: Huseyin Devre

Answer the following questions after or as you review a peer's paper.

RESEARCH QUESTION or PROBLEM STATEMENT

1. What is the project about? What "puzzle" is the writer trying to resolve? What is the need they are trying to address or the problem they are trying to solve? Please identify and, in your own words, restate the writer's research question or topic.

This project aims at testing the use of state of the art NER algorithms on different literary text types such as Fictinoal and Nonfictional as well as attempting to determine a better hybrid algorithm.

2. Is the research question or problem statement clear and precise? Does it address a problem that is interesting and relevant?

The research question is straightforward and the problem is definitely interesting and relevant. There is also the use of some domain adaptation and its uses can be seen in our everyday lives as students come across so many different text types and this could be a novel way of understanding something we are so in touch with.

ARGUMENT

3. What is the author's main point or argument? Please restate it in your own words.

He hasn't completed his conclusion and analysis so I don't know what his argument is.

4. Is the main point or argument clear and precise? Does it answer the research question?

He hasn't completed his conclusion and analysis so I don't know what his argument is.

RESEARCH DESIGN

5. Does the writer provide a clear and convincing "road map" of the research project? Is the data used suitable and enough to answer the research question?

Yes there is a clear road map of how the project is going to look, the experiments going to be ran and the data is peer-reviewd and substantial.

6. Does the writer have a sufficient number of sources for references? Are there a diversity of sources, i.e. are they all from different areas, book, internet, articles, journals, etc. Are the sources relevant to the research question? Do the sources provide new information to aid in answering the research question or problems statement?

Although the references section isn't completed just looking at the related works shows the amount of research and diversity in the sources to cover the abundant information.

STRUCTURE and LANGUAGE

7. Is the paper well organized?

The paper is well organizaed but the related works seems to very long, looking forward to see the analysis and experiements results.

8. Is there a logical flow of information and analysis?

Yes the flow of information is clear and the connection to earlier statements makes it easier to understand what is being said.

9. Are the paragraphs coherent? How are the transitions?

The transitions are spot on using phrases like as previously stated and also the references to the diagrams are very effective and done in a way so the context around them can be understood as well.

10. How is the language? Is the paper well-written (engaging)? Are there any colloquialisms and slang that should be removed?

The language is very technical and shows a wide range of knowledge on the topic. The little grammar mistakes can be easily rectified by sending to the writing centre otherwise great work.

OVERALL

11. Is the paper overall coherent?

Yes the paper overall is coherent

12. Do you have any general comments and suggestions?

My only thing is that although the related works is really informative it also takes up a big chunk of your research paper so you can also look at focusing a lot more on the different experiments you ran and make the analysis of the errors being propagated in the conventional methods as compared to yours. Otherwise great work!

WRITER'S SELF-ASSESSMENT *(To be done after receiving peer feedback)*

1. What was the main idea that you tried to convey and did the reviewer understand it? How can you make it clearer (if needed)?

My paper focuses on the performance of three learning methods, Global Context Enhanced Deep Transition Architecture (GCDT) without BERT embedding, Flair, Bidirectional Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) + Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and Adapting Transformer Encoder for Named Entity Recognition Architecture (TENER) in Fictional, Non-Fiction and fantasy corpus. The reader understood it well

2. What area or areas do you most want to revisit or improve (i.e. which areas/aspects do you most want to rework)?

I think that I need to work on the related work section. I need to correct my grammar.

3. What are you most proud of in your paper and want to make sure you keep in each draft?

I liked how others liked some parts of my paper. I think that I can improve overall paper to keep in each draft