

Summary:

The report satisfied most of the requirements. However, there are two weakness. The first one is that the performance part is not reliable enough since no cross-validation is performed to get a standard error of accuracy. Secondly, not enough explanations and discussions about their result.

Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing

1. Is the report clearly written ?
4 points
2. Is there a good use of examples and figures?
4 points. figure label missed in PCA plot
3. Is it well organized?
5 points
4. Are there problems with style and grammar?
5 points
5. Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.?
5 points

Evaluation on Technical Quality

1. Are the results technically sound?
5 points
2. Are there obvious flaws in the reasoning?
5 points
3. Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental results?
5 points
4. Are the experiments well thought out and convincing?
3 points
5. Will it be possible for other researchers to replicate these results?
5 points
6. Is the evaluation appropriate?
3 points
7. Did the authors clearly assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their approach?
4 points
8. Are relevant papers cited, discussed, and compared to the presented work?
5 points

Overall rating: 4

Confidence on your assessment: 2