

MATH 6380o. Advanced Topics in Deep Learning

Fall 2019

Group 14:

- Describe the strengths of the report.

New technique to predict MNIST dataset.

- Describe the weaknesses of the report.

Low accuracy compared to the-state-of-the-art performance and other peers on the same dataset.

- Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5): Is the report clearly written? Is there a good use of examples and figures? Is it well organized? Are there problems with style and grammar? Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.? Please make suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper, and provide details of typos.

I will give a mark of 3. The report is well presented but it lacks content (only one poster given). No reference is provided.

- Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): Are the results technically sound? Are there obvious flaws in the reasoning? Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental results? Are the experiments well thought out and convincing? Will it be possible for other researchers to replicate these results? Is the evaluation appropriate? Did the authors clearly assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their approach? Are relevant papers cited, discussed, and compared to the presented work?

I will give a mark of 2. Claims are not supported by experimental results. I do not understand why we should delete the last layer of Resnet to replace it by VGG. It does not make sense.

- Overall rating: (5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2- below average. 1- a poorly written one).

3- An average one

- Confidence on your assessment (1-3) (3- I have carefully read the paper and checked the results, 2- I just browse the paper without checking the details, 1- My assessment can be wrong)

A mark of 3.