**Article 1**

In this report, the author illustrate the approximate matching method which is a combination of global edit distance and soundex. Firstly, author introduce the detail of twitter, and then he give a flowchart of this method that according to two times matching to catch the best match. Moreover, this report gives four directions to improve this matching method and some specific solution without detailed explanation. For aspects of improvement are accuracy, efficiency, semantics and context, sentiment concern and number. In experiment part, this report just give a screenshot about matching result of several words. But there is no data of precision and recall.

1.The author gives a very detailed explanation of Edit Distance and Sundex. It is easy to understand the that composite method through the flow chart. Starting with the Global Edit Distance and doing sundex after that.

2. The author fully analyzes and considers the source of data and existing data. Before state that composite method, there are specific analysis of twitter data type and the dictionary. In the “draw and further development” part, the author analysis fully incorporates the given data. That is laudable.

3. In terms of the selection method, the report gives the reasonable reasons for choosing the combination of the two methods. For instance, the author compared global edit distance and local distance.

`1.Add more critical thinking.

In this report, it analysis the disadvantage of the composite method, but there are few words talk about advantage of this method. Another problem is that there is no any hypothesis, so there are no conclusions from valid experiments.

2Add more strong experiment data.

Although the author gives several conclusions, but none of them is supported by valid experiment data. Therefore, opinions are more like an unwarranted inference, not strong enough to convince others. In addition, like I mentioned before, this report locks some fundamental computation, such as precision and recall.

**Article my**

In my report, I focused on the causes of spelling errors and how to use some of them to optimize the application of the edit distance algorithm in string matching. In the beginning, I introduced aspects of spelling normalization that can be applied to Twitter and identified areas that can be optimized. I then discussed how the distribution of keyboards in real life can affect spelling errors, and used this as inspiration to improve global editing distances. Finally, the experiment proves that the changing weight of insertion，deletion and replacement according to the actual situation is an effective optimization method.

In the process of thinking, I have an open mind in considering the theme. In accidental testing, the accidental discovery of different weights will lead to different results. So I was inspired by this phenomenon and finished the research of this paper. Moreover, in order to obtain the expected experimental results, I selected different data purposefully. The results of the experiment can prove that my idea is valuable and worth improving.

After reading comments from other students, I didn’t explain the changing weight of different operations clearly an experiment. One people said that “I cannot see the change in weight to replacement (as in, replacement stays at -1), which leads to confusion. The report is too concise.” This question does cause confusion and is one of the most important areas for improvement in my report. I'm just raising the importance of replacement in all operations, not the specific value (from m=0,r=-1,d=-1,i=-1 to m=0,r=-1,d=-2,i=-2). Such expressions can cause confusion in reading. Besides, I should choose experiment data more careful and cautious. When changing the experimental data, it is best to set the exclusive data for each different content to be tested.

**Article 2**

In this report, the author pointed out the basics condition of Twitter and the content of the existing data. The author also explained the Global Edit Distance and Neighborhood search method in detail. To make the article clearer, the author explained the concepts of accuracy and precision. In the experiment part, this report compares the results(precision, times and accuracy) of two methods. In the expression of global editing distance, the author explains it with detailed data. The author finally states that it is a more effective method to obtain the edit distance from experimental results.

Overall, this article is a good quality file. The author conducted a literature study on the problem and made a successful conclusion by applying the experiment. The advantage of a large group of articles is that the end of the concept is very clear, which means that the conclusion can be very clear when reading this article. In addition, in comparing the two methods, the authors used more diverse measures (with added time) and real data examples.

The deficiency is that the author explains the concept in too much detail. The condition of this report is to assume that the reader already has relevant knowledge. As a result, the analysis part of the experiment is less and the experimental conclusion is too concise. In addition, the analysis of the experiment by the author is a little bit simple. And the comparison of data such as accuracy and time is not explored at a deeper level but the conclusion that the method is better is simply drawn. However, I think it is a more valuable topic to make any valuable Suggestions on why such an outcome or thing could bring about the application of the method.