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. [15]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW5 final score: Excellent

2. Comment:
   1) Their report is good.
   2) Their demo could be more detailed
   3) Their result in task2 could be do more experiment to modify it.

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 2)

1. Scores: Excellent

2. Comments:
   - They explained their work well
   - The results are good
   - Their report are clean enough

Reviewer # 2 (Group 5)

1. Scores: Good

2. Comments:
   - The implementation is good and well represented
   - Demo video can provide more details
   - Could be better if try more k values and bag of word size to show the result
   - Also with the SVM implementation can show the comparison of different results of different costs c.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 31)

1. Scores: Excellent

2. Comments:
   1. The report is clear.
   2. In task 2, the n variable of KNN could be set higher to increase accuracy.
   3. The bonus result is good.