

Area Chair Information

Group No. [2]

	Student ID	Name
Member 1	309553015	林志軒
Member 2	309551113	陳鵬宇
Member 3	309551009	陳璽存

Submitter Information

Group No. [3]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW2 final score: Good
2. Comment:
 - a. Their demo were clear enough.
 - b. The results of task 1 and 3 can be further improved.
 - c. They didn't implement additional optimal strategy.

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 22)

1. Scores: Good
2. Comments:
 - a. They explain their procedure clearly.
 - b. The results in task 1 and 3 are not good enough.
 - c. Our suggestion is that they can do more work about processing images in task 3 .

Reviewer # 2 (Group 28)

Computer Vision HW 2, Review Report

1. Scores: Good
2. Comments:
 - a. Their results meet the homework requirements, but they didn't do some extra optimal techniques. And compare their results to other teams, their results seem mediocre.
 - b. Their oral presentation is very clear to understand.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 29)

1. Scores: Good
2. Comments: The result of laplacian pyramid is a little strange. But still can feel that they work hard on it. And the explanation is very detailed.