Summary:

The report satisfied most of the requirements, It also did the fine-tune work. 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, it said they visualized the features using PCA, while only t-SNE plots were presented in poster.

Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing

1. Is the report clearly written ?

   5 points

2. Is there a good use of examples and figures?

   2 points

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