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Critique of Justice Nii-Ayitey’s Literature Review

**Length of paper:**

In Justice’s review of developments in document clustering he goes thoroughly through developments in both supervised and unsupervised learning. The original review article is relatively long and very dense, with many mathematical equations and algorithms, and Justice was able to condense this paper into a good review of its major points. Justice also divided the paper into logical sections, relating back to the original paper.

**Depth of Understanding:**

In his written review Justice does well at explaining the general concepts of supervised and unsupervised learning, and further explaining the different predictive models that belong to these two classes. He also summarizes the concepts of document clustering and gives good examples of why researchers may use document clustering. However, in his oral presentation it appeared Justice often did not understand the questions that were being asked of him, often not answering the question completely. This is his weakest point in his presentation, answering questions from an audience is a very important aspect of sharing research and if you are not able to do so it can hinder the impact of your work. The presentation slides share the same strengths that the written review, giving summaries of very broad concepts in document clustering.

**Completeness:**

Justice was able to completely go through the paper and review it in its entirety, not missing any major aspects of the paper. He also used outside sources to further build upon the review paper.

**Difficulty:**

The review chosen was relatively long and contained many different types of dimension reduction and clustering models that are not easy to understand if one is not familiar. He was able to take these ideas and digest them into easy to understandable summaries, for example, with his section on dimensionality reduction he was able to take each method of reduction and explain how the algorithms differ from one another, along with what each type of reduction is used for. This shows an understanding of multiple concepts and ideas presented in the literature.

**Comprehensiveness:**

The review covered all the topics presented in the original paper. However, more attention could have been spent explaining the different equations presented in the paper. Only once did Justice use an equation provided in his review, if more time had been spent trying to incorporate these into his paper it would have been fully comprehensive.

**Clarity:**

The review was entirely clear, with little to no major grammatical errors that hindered the reader from understanding the review. The paper was broken down into sensible sections that flowed well throughout the paper, along with good opening and closing sections. The figures provided also helped explain some of the concepts, perhaps if more were included it would have been more beneficial.