Peer review of group 8

October 19, 2019

1 Summary

The report uses the Raphael paintings dataset. First the authors use a ScatterNet and a Pre-trained VGG19 to perform feature extraction and train the neural net on top of it. They conclude that the VGG19 features are preferable because the model based on them converges much faster. Then they use PCA to visualise the features. Finally they train an SVM and a KNN model for prediction on the feature and predict the class of the disputed paintings.

2 Strengths and Weaknesses

1. Conclusions are sound
2. Very little text and explanation
3. The presentation as a Jupiter notebook somewhat makes up for this
4. Simpler and shorter than most other reports

3 Writing

This report is presented as a Jupiter notebook. It mostly consists a of source code with titles and two short analysis sections in between. There are a some typos in both those sections, but it's still understandable what the authors mean. Overall very little information is provided through text. One mostly has to analyse the code by oneself to understand what is happening precisely. The fact that it's presented in a Jupiter notebook makes this somewhat easier. Finally I think that making a table comparing the 4 prediction methods explored would be a nice and clean way to summarise your results. The report is understandable but not nice

to read. Typos: 'transfoer',' the deep learning model perform', 'a fast and study decrease in both traing','acheaving', plural s are often missing, the grammar is sometimes questionable
Score: 2.5/5

4 Technical quality

I couldn't detect any flaws in the reasoning in your report. The analysis is sound and correct. However, you could have done more things such as visualisation of features and exploration of more prediction methods. This would have allowed for more meaningful conclusions.
Score: 3/5

5 Conclusion

The content of the report is fine. It would benefit from more explaining text and the exploration of other methods for both visualisation and prediction. There are some typos in the analysis.
Score: 3/5

6 Confidence of assessment

I read the report carefully, understood it, read the code.
Score 3/3