<p align="center" style="color:red">PIONEER PROJECT PEER REVIEW FORM</p>

Reviewer: Arihant Gupta
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 project is about NER tagging/algorithms on different literary texts such as nonfiction and fiction. The project aims to create a better algorithm to suit the NER tagging needs by attempting to create a "hybrid."

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

The question and problem statement are both clear and precise. The problem at hand is relevant as it connects to the mass as a whole. Nonfiction and Fiction texts are what we, as humans, read everyday. To see a machine learning adaptation on the fundamentals such as reading and mere words on a page brings a new twist to how we look at readings.

ARGUMENT 3. What is the author's main point or argument? Please restate it in your own words.
The main point that is trying to be made is to test the differences and similarities of TensorFlow, Bert, and GCDT on nonfiction and fictional tests.

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

The main point and argument is clear and precise. The problem statement is clearly labeled in the abstract and the rest of the research paper follows suit. The research question is answered (assuming that it will be when the analysis and data come in).
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?

There is a clear and convincing "road map" created by the writer. The background information and procedure for the project are very detailed and thorough. All that is left is the data to be implemented so that the research question can be answered.

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?

The resources seem to be used to their full capacity. There seems to be a lot of diversity (based off of the diagrams, in text citations, and examples used.) The sources all help to create the structural flow that the project has. Even though the references section isn't complete, the rest of the project looks substantial.

STRUCTURE and LANGUAGE

7. Is the paperwell organized?

The paper is organized but gets cumbersome to read/analyze; especially with the amount of information put into the paper.

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

There is a logical flow in the paper that allows the reader to move from one point to another. However, the analysis still needs to be completed. It should contain information that wraps the data and experiments into a whole.

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

The paragraphs are coherent. They each have their own idea and main topic to complement them. The transitions are very clear and allow for an appropriate move from one statement to another.

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

The language is research paper worthy. It is very technical and straight to the point. There are no slang words that should be removed.

OVERALL
11. Is the paper overall coherent?

The paper is overall coherent.

12. Do you have any general comments and suggestions?

Only comment I would have would be for the length of the paper. The topic is very interesting and pulling but it may be hard for the reader to unpack so much information in one sitting.

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)?

The main idea I tried to convey was tagging dementia clinical journals with the Unigram Tagger (changed research statement). I can make it clearer by clearly identifying the issue in the introduction.

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

Areas to improve are editing for verbage and grammar usage (verb tenses).

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

I am most proud of the reassessment section related works and the experimentation used to determine my research problem.

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

I need to fix the gramer. I should make the paper clear. I should add references.

I think that I liked how others liked my research question. I think that I learned finding a good research question with Prof. Pradhan Pioneer Academics