

Summary:

The report satisfied most of the requirements. There are three 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, In prediction part, I cannot understand the result in the table, are they good or not? Thirdly, in image classification part, it said that ScatNet lacks data augmentation, but results of ScatNet seem better than ResNet18

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?
3 points
3. Is it well organized?
4 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?
3 points
2. Are there obvious flaws in the reasoning?
5 points
3. Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental results?
3 points
4. Are the experiments well thought out and convincing?
4 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?
3 points
8. Are relevant papers cited, discussed, and compared to the presented work?
5 points

Overall rating: 3

Confidence on your assessment: 2