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|  | **Title** | **Abstract** | **Intro and Background** | **Lit review** | **Methodology** | **Solution** | **Findings/conclusion/ future work** | **Referencing and language** |
| Understanding Handwritten Prescriptions by Using VGG16 and Bi-LSTM | Might want to mention novelty in your solution | Good – can be a bit shorter and more focused | Needs improvement-  No citations!!  Too much focus on methodology and results background and problem justification and advantages from solving is not highlighted enough | Move background section to first section.  Analysis of similar systems reads are more like a summary than a review. Maybe include the analysis in tabular form.  Should also be more comprehensive and detailed as you have 1 more page.  Can include a technical review of current AI architectures and models. | No details of the dataset used for training, or the data cleaning/augmentation used.  No details of how the dataset was split.  ROI algorithm is just mentioned but details not given.  The diagram for architecture is not clear and it’s not explained at all.  Might be good to show the difference in hyperparameters for different blocks using a table.  Should be written in order – currently preprocessing is the last paragraph. | Move details of final architecture including diagram and details to this section | Can further summarize the details of the different trials – or just explain the final trial.  Use a table to highlight key differences made for different trails.  Key evaluation criteria of last model are missing, Confusion matrix. Accuracy. F1 score etc.  Overall model accuracy (73%) needs to be improved. And difference in training and validation (63%) accuracy is too large | Citations are lacking in main text.  Should have 15-20 relevant references |
| Mind Relax: Smart System for Negative Emotion and Negative Mental Stress Detection, Monitoring and Management | Too long. Must be more focused – mention approach and novelty | good | Good but can be more detailed | Good but lacking details. Use a separate table in each section to identify and highlight key features and weaknesses in each paper analyzed. | For each component discuss the dataset including source, number of records, number of features, split used, any data cleaning or augmentations carried out.  No need for flow charts as they are not research. | Focus on the AI models and for each component explain in detail the final model created including hyper parameter details | For each model, the final evaluation results in the same format and structure. Consistency is key. Based on these say what can be done in future improve model performance | Citations should start from 1 not 21.  Some errors in English proofread carefully |
| Breaking Barriers for Deaf Primary Schoolchildren: Sinhala Sign Language, Emotion Detection, and Sound Recognition  **My name is spelled wrong.** | Need improvement - Rewrite focusing title on the research contribution and novelty | The 3 key elements all part of 1 app? Writing makes it seem otherwise.  Describe the technical approach a bit more here | Can be shortened slightly. Same things are repeated.  The first section must combine the 4 backgrounds seamlessly. Currently its obvious its written separately by 4 people. | Lit review covers only 3 components. Not very clear.  Good but lacking details. Use a separate table in each section to identify and highlight key features and weaknesses in each paper analyzed. | For each component discuss the dataset including source, number of records, number of features, split used, any data cleaning or augmentations carried out.  No need for flow charts as they are not research. | Focus on the AI models and for each component explain in detail the final model created including hyper parameter details.  The solution is section is very shallow and missing details of the models developed and focus too much on the development and functionality of the system and not the research contribution.  Remover the example pictures and give details of model architecture.  Major changes and revisions required in this section | The evaluation section is good but can be made consistent for the 4 sections with the same metrices being presented in the same order. | Citations must be improved. Some claims are not cited/justified,  1st reference is missing information.  Some references are outdated and from 2011. |
| Smart Navigation System For Supermarket  **My name is spelled wrong.** | Mention IOT in title | Too long. Should be shorter. Currently includes too much detail about the solution but not much else. | Some claims for problem is missing citations.  Section is too long and contains too much details about the solution and decisions made– these should go in methodology and solution sections  Focus on the actual problem and what can be achieved by solving it | This section should have 2-3 papers for each component which is reviewed. Then use a table for each section to highlight features and weaknesses of each paper. | For each component discuss the dataset including source, number of records, number of features, split used, any data cleaning or augmentations carried out.  Focus on what you did and why you did it rather than other things.  Explain the steps you took out in order of how you did them. | Should be a separate section.  Do not include code snippets. Explain the solutions logic using formal diagrams such as flow charts and activity diagrams.  For AI projects include details of the model built, its architecture and the final key hyper parameters. | Should be a separate section. Describe the steps taken to evaluate the final solution and the results. Should compare it with other systems analyzed in lit review.  Is too long with unnecessary details. Future work and conclusions must be very targeted on outcome and possible future improvements. | English is very weak. Most sections will need to be revised to improve the grammar and the flow of the paper. |
| AI-Enabled Approaches for Enhancing Mental Wellbeing through Stress Predictions | Good – meant for conference paper or journal?? | Good but a bit too long. Shorten by about 50 words. | Way too long. Some content is entirely not required – eg 2nd para in this section  Very much lacking citations |  |  |  |  | Some references are completely unsuitable for a research paper. |
| Dee Learning Based Approach for Real-Time Traffic Signal Optimization and Vehicle surveillance | Good | Good but the problem is not properly justified – only 1 sentence.  The explanation about the 4 components are not integrated properly and language does not flow | Good background but after the first para no citations for claims.  Once again, the flow of the writing is not good, clear its been written separately and added together.  Is too short. Needs to cover 2-3 papers for each component. Can summarize and use tables for analysis | This section should have 2-3 papers for each component which is reviewed. Then use a table for each section to highlight features and weaknesses of each paper. | For each component discuss the dataset including source, number of records, number of features, split used, any data cleaning or augmentations carried out.  Also justify the type of AI selected for the solution | For AI projects include details of the model built, its architecture and the final key hyper-parameters.  This is not included at all in the paper. | Put separate sections for discussion of results for each component.  Have more metrics than just accuracy as evaluation. And compare with other systems.  This section is too long and should be shortened.  Keep the evaluation more consistent for the 4 components. | Referencing and citations must be improved. 15-20 references required.  Some are outdated |