Second project review

1. Repo quality
   a. <u>Is it clear and consequent?</u>
   The description of the repository is nice. In particular, the author describes the purpose of all (or almost all) files presented in the repo.

   b. <u>How would you improve the repo? Give your estimation of the repo based on this.</u>
   I didn't find any requirements.txt file or something like that. Actually such a mistake can possibly lead to poor reproducibility of the project.

2. <u>Reproducibility</u>
   All is OK. However I would suggest adding requirements.txt file. Moreover, docker container — is a good solution for many possible reproducibility issues.

3. <u>Coherency of conclusions</u>
   Experiment results and conclusions in the paper are consistent with each other. However I would like to give some recommendations to the paper:
   - It's a bit unusual that the Introduction section doesn't contain any reference to some previous work.
   - The Introduction section itself is written in a somewhat original way. Usually researchers provide some smooth intro to the topic and citing previous authors.
   - Some mathematical notations are missed.
   - The author provides some figures, but doesn't refer to them in the text.