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1. Generally ok, it follows the general structure of materials->methods->results, this might however, not be the optimal choice for a research paper. As it makes it hard to find subsections of information

However, some parts should be structured at other segments, such as the inks should be at materials.

1. Superfluous: Adjectives which do not have a merit:

The study showcased **impressive** progress …

Furthermore there was very little explored upon the machine learning aspect, as in what ways it can be used.

1. English is satisfactory
2. The abstract contains all the important points
3. Comments:  
   there seems to be some repetition between certain parts.

some parts are not to the point, i. e. a lot of information is partially given.

1. Rating: Good