General Improvements on the paper:

1. You could do an edit pass over the abstract: currently its a bit too detailed, so that someone who isnt in the field will have trouble understanding what you're doing.
   It might help to talk about autoguide in more general abstract terms, maybe as not needing to specify an importance distribution when using VI---so that you can facilitate inferernce as optimisation. (Complete)

2. There's also perhaps some extra stuff including mcmc in chap2 or the moralisation and inversion in chap3; you should try to make it clear that these things are not the point of your project, but maybe there for completeness sake. (Complete)

3. You should also remember to cite/refeence where some of the material (e.g. figures for moralisation/inversion) come from in the captions for those figures. (Complete)

Evaluation part on the paper:

1. fig 4.1-4.8 should be 1 figure with subfig labels (Complete)
2. the captions should indicate what dataset they are for (GMM); similarly for the other clusters of individual figures. (Complete)
3. you should clearly explain what the task requires does by maybe showing an image? there's a lot of stuff hidden in the text inbetween images that makes it hard to see what's being checked (e.g. positive slope for african countries in income dataset). Complete, I have mentioned in the datasets and tasks part, even in the aim of experiments part. Please check that!
4. you should explain why you chose these graphs/metrics---was it because other methods in pyro or somewhere else used these? are they standard things to compute? otherwise the reader has no idea why yo're asking these questions in the text. (Complete). Yeah, in the aim of the experiments I said its standardized in pyro.
5. your tables don't have standard-dev for the computed metrics. Ideally each thing you compute must be computed with, say, 10 random seeds, and you report the mean and standard deviation to show that the difference in results is not just a fluke in the chosen seed (Complete). Yes. It's a thing that I need to pay attention to in the future.

Overall commment from prof. Siddharth N.

Overall I'd say it could be much better, but I think you've at least managed to make a reasonably complete document.