

Area Chair Information

Group No. [20]

	Student ID	Name
Member 1	409556002	張桂華
Member 2	309553024	胡瑞麟
Member 3	309553035	周千賀

Submitter Information

Group No. [3]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW5 final score: Excellent
2. Comment:
 - The report is well-written and the code is clear.
 - Their demonstration video clearly explains their work
 - They explain the implementation procedure very well.
 - They have conducted many experiments and compared the accuracy among them (with/without normalization, random feature selection, different CNN models).

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:
 - Their implentations are fine and complete
 - Their demonstraton video clearly explains their work

- Their performance fits the expectation of homework spec

Reviewer # 2 (Group 16)

1. Scores: Excellent
2. Comments:
 - a. Clear code and report.
 - b. Tried additional deep learning methods.
 - c. The results look good, achieving the baseline mentioned in the spec.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 27)

1. Scores: Excellent
2. Comments:
 - Their code is correct and clear.
 - Their experiment results of each task look great.
 - Their report is written in detail and well-organized.
 - They explain the implementation procedure very well.
 - They have conducted many experiments and compared the accuracy among them (with/without normalization, random feature selection, different CNN models).
 - They did a great job on the whole.