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. [6]

Area Chair Summary

1. HW3 final score: Good

2. Comment: Their performance looks good. However, they should put more effort on the report and describe their code.

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 28)

1. Scores: Excellent

2. Comments:
   a. Their oral presentation is clear to understand.
   b. They try to use only the top 15% of matching points to calculate the homographic matrix H. The result is indeed better than using all of the matching points.

Reviewer # 2 (Group 26)

1. Scores: Good

2. Comments:
   (1) They try different method of warping to get better result, having better warping result than other groups.
   (2) They didn't descript their code, and there is no code even in the report.

Reviewer # 3 (Group 18)

1. Scores: Good

2. Comments:
   - None of the feature matches are shown
   - We suggest they to do more experiments (e.g. Multi-band blending)
   - We suggest they to put more effort on organizing report
   - They filtered the matched keypoints by directly selecting the ones with least error. That is quite different from ratio distance.