Area Chair Information

Group No. [3]

	Student ID	Name
Member 1	0751231	曾揚
Member 2	309505018	郭俊廷
Member 3		

Submitter Information

Group No. [22]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW1 final score: Good

2. Comment:
It seems like their explanation on the theorem was clear, but their implementation was a bit different from OpenCV's.They didn't fully understand the picture's rotation and some math formula. So, I think the final score is Good.

Reviewers Comments

TAs will collect all the reviewing results of the same group, and provide them below. Do not change it, you should give the final score based on these comments.

Reviewer # 1 (Group 1)

1. Scores: Okay

2. Comments:
   We think they did okay, they follow the implementation steps properly, they also did some normalization on the dataset, however they didn't really explain the maths behind their implementation, and also the end results were a bit different from OpenCV's. We also think that their report needs to be more detailed, their current report is too simple.

Reviewer # 2 (Group 20)

1. Scores: Good

2. Comments:
   Group 22 encountered some weird phenomenon about Homography. They found that in camera visualization, most of the camera positions are correct but two of them appear at the wrong position. These two camera Homography values are quite different from OpenCV's findHomography(). This problem seems to be related to rotation, so they added some code to deal with image rotation and rotating X, Y axis accordingly, but they didn't fully understand why they have to do this image rotation trick quite well. The final result of camera visualization is similar to OpenCV's version.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 13)

1. Scores: Good

2. Comments:
   The theory they explained was clear. They dealt with the picture's rotation and confirmed whether the experimental results have improved, but they did not explain why the image's rotation would cause a difference.