\_Summary of the report.

\_ Describe the strengths of the report.

\_ Describe the weaknesses of the report.

\_ 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.

\_ 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?

\_ 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).

\_ 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)

Project CaoYang&ZengWenQi

Summary: The projects compares the performance of lowering down data dimensions and clustering featured data groups between PCA, MDS and t-SNE. It also compares the performance of classification by combining Random Forrest.

Strength: Detailed explanation on why t-SNE performs better than PCA in this case.

Weakness: Lack of the illustration for graphs and why introduce Random Forrest.

\_ Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5) 5

\_ Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): 4

\_ Overall rating: 4

\_ Confidence on your assessment: 3