

PIONEER PROJECT PEER REVIEW FORM

Reviewer: Sally Song
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.

The author tries to discover whether literary text types affect the performance of his Named Entity recognition algorithm. The algorithm, specifically, is trained using TensorFlow and BERT Embeddings and Global Context Enhanced Deep Transition Architecture for Sequence Labeling

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

The research question states the purpose of his work relatively clearly, although it could be expressed in a more concise manner. The problem he chose to address is interesting, as it offers insight into the interaction between literature and machine learning, it also explores a bit of domain adaptation. The topic has huge potential in terms of exploring the field of text mining. The problem is also incredibly relevant to our everyday life as us students will be asked to analyze different literary text types throughout our academic careers.

ARGUMENT

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

He hasn't completed the analysis/conclusion sections yet, 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 the analysis/conclusion sections yet, 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?

The structure of his road map is clear and easy to follow. The data he used is professional and peer-reviewed, as well as suitable for the project he undertook.

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?

He hasn't completed the references section yet, but as I can tell from his related works section, he did get his sources from a range of areas to cover various topics. His related works section is very informative and contributes a lot to explaining the problem he is trying to solve.

STRUCTURE and LANGUAGE

7. Is the paper well organized?

The paper is organized and the structure is clear. One concern I have is with where the author put the focus of the paper on - the "related works" section seems to be extremely long while not much is written in the analysis and results section, the section that should be the main focus of the paper. However, he is still completing the analysis and results section, so I am looking forward to see his updated work.

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

Yes. His information is logically connected throughout the paper. I also noticed that very often he would relate some information back early parts of his paper where he mentioned relevant information. This is a great habit that increases the interconnectedness of his paper and allows the reader to understand the information better.

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

He is good at using conjunctions such as "as stated previously" or "moreover" to connect his paragraphs. His paper is coherent and easy to read through.

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

There are one or two slight grammatical errors that can be corrected by sending his paper to the writing center for review. Besides that, his language is professional and direct, conveying difficult information in the plainest way possible. It is likely to be engaging — as engaging as a research paper can be — for a wide range of audience.

OVERALL

11. Is the paper overall coherent?

Yes

12. Do you have any general comments and suggestions?

Your paper is very interesting and insightful. The hugeness of the "related works" section was helpful in that it allowed me to understand more of the topic you are trying to tackle.

Don't indent your sections. There are many nested sections in your paper that are indented almost across half the page and are not very visually pleasing.

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 should complete the references. I should fix my grammar. I think I can write a clear related work.

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

I liked how others find my research question interesting. I think I can think on it.