1. Briefly summarise what the author has done

The author predicts the best matches for each token in the document and evaluate the predictions by using Neighborhood Search, Global Edit Distance and N-Gram methods.

2. Indicate what you think that the author has done well, and why

1) The author uses tables to show the results, which is clear enough to see.

2) The author explains the results well and make some examples to prove his explanation.

3) The author considers the influence of some noisy factors such as abbreviation and homophone, which is good.

1. Indicate what you think could have been improved, and why

1) For the related work part, the author should add more references to introduce what people have done about spelling correction or lexical normalization instead of talking about the definition of spelling correction.

2) I am a little confused about why the author set n equals to 2 in N-Gram. I think the author should set more values to n, and compare their performances, finally find the best one. That is because 3-Gram has a better performance after comparing their performances when n equals 1 to 4 in my experiment.

3) For the evaluation part, the author doesn’t make it clear for the evaluation metrics. I don’t know how the precision and recall calculate. What is the system precision? Is it average precision or not? According to his analysis part, his system considers the same string to be the best match when the source string exists in the dictionary. Therefore, the precision may consider the result of exact match.

4) I think the result is not convincible. The author should use tables to make it clear that how many returned predictions and how many correct predictions are, because my result of precision of GED is only around 20%, but the result he got is around 46%.

The author implements two algorithms to compare their average precision in a spelling correction task.

2.

1) The author uses tables and figures to show the results, which is good.

2) The author explains the method well. He doesn’t explain what is the Levenshtein distance instead of how to relate this method to the experiment, which is good.

3.

1) For the Introduction part, it should be briefly summarized instead of introducing everything in detail.

2) The report is a formal report, which should be well formatted. For example, center the table and may use the report structure in template.

3) For the related research part, it should be added more research about what people have done in spelling correction area instead of only using one reference that professor gives.

4) The explanation of how to use Levenshtein distance and American Soundex is almost same. The author should explain how the system works once, which is enough.

5) The author shouldn’t explain the rules of Soundex and 2-Gram in detail, because we are all familiar with this method, and it is waste of paper.

6) The evaluation metric included in this report is only precision. I think the author should add recall to make it more scientific.

7) I am a little confused about the result of precision of Misspell dataset, which is 90.8%. In my point of view, it may mean directly return the token in Misspell dataset without spelling correction algorithm and evaluate the precision with Correct dataset. However, this step doesn’t make sense.

8) The analysis is not convincible. The author doesn’t provide illustrative examples to prove his statement, and he just state some points from intuition, which is not scientific.

9) His conclusion is also not convincible, the precision of Levenshtein Distance is only slightly higher than the performance of Soundex. The difference is only around 0.03%, we couldn’t conclude that Levenshtein Distance has greater performance than American Soundex.