

MATH 6380o. Advanced Topics in Deep Learning

Fall 2019

Group 2:

- Describe the strengths of the report.

The group has correctly implemented some cutting-edge algorithms to predict MNIST dataset.

- Describe the weaknesses of the report.

The report is great but is missing of more state-of-the-art classifiers.

- 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 4 as most of the report is great however some pictures are irrelevant and repetitive.

- 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 4 because no cross validation was carried out. We can replicate the results due to the consistent report provided. The evaluation is appropriate. They have not stated the strengths and weaknesses of their approach. No references are provided.

- 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).

4- A good report.

- 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.