

Area Chair Information

Group No. [8]

	Student ID	Name
Member 1	309552064	吳冠潔
Member 2	0616215	蘇信恩
Member 3	0616220	李祐辰

Submitter Information

Group No. [3]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW1 final score:

Good

2. Comment:

It seems like that although they explained their code quite clearly during demonstrations, their report could use some improvement, probably by illustrating more about the formula derivation, along with further discussion.

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 4)

1. Scores: Okay

2. Comments:

(1) They do not really understand their code and the theory behind the camera calibration actually. (e.g. They do not know why they check the diagonal value of B and multiply it with minus 1.)

(2) The procedure part in the report did not contain formula derivation.

(3) The content of the discussion part in their report looks like the conclusion.

Reviewer # 2 (Group 22)

1. Scores: Good
2. Comments:
 - a. They explain their procedure clearly.
 - b. But their results are not similar to Opencv's.
 - c. Our suggestion is that they can make further discussion in the report.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 26)

1. Scores: Good
2. Comments:
 - (1) The program explained clearly.
 - (2) Their report a little bit short, the procedure part could be more detailed.
 - (3) There are no something ambiguous in their result.