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Please fill in your findings on the paper to review according to the following criteria. We grade the peer review according to:

* Depth: by showing that you have read the draft pointing to both strong and weak aspects.
* Clarity: by mentioning the weaknesses along with actionable suggestions for improvement.

Use the remainder of this document as an answer sheet.

**Readability**: Does the text make sense? Are all parts (abstract, intro, related work, methods, results, conclusion) included? Are all sentences complete? Are there typos? Etc.

|  |
| --- |
| The paper does not yet have all the sections included. It is missing the Results, Discussions and Conclusions. In addition some of the abstract is also missing (due to the fact that there are no results). I assume that the group had just not completed their full analysis at the time of writing the paper draft. |

**Abstract**: Is the abstract short? Is it intriguing? Does it summarize all important elements of the general problem, solution, and the results achieved?

|  |
| --- |
| The abstract is short and gives information about the task at hand. I do find myself being lost in the technicalities of the tools being used rather than understanding the nature of the task at hand fully.  I think the abstract could have more information about the general problem with cloud removal and why your approach is proposed. The abstract does not have a result yet. |

**Introduction**: Is it clear that: (i) We have a relevant research question, (ii) This is not an easy research question and there are theoretical/methodological challenges to finding an answer to this question, (iii) Your contribution is addressing (and overcoming) those challenges, (iv) Positioning of the work next to earlier related work.

|  |
| --- |
| The introduction provides a clear description of the task at hand and the importance of the research question. The paper poses worthwhile and challenging questions. I think the introduction could contain more information about the background work and information before the Related Work section to give more meaning to the networks that will be used. For example, what are the different types of land cover or how many types of land cover are there? Also, it would be interesting to see more justification as to why the chosen tools and the pipeline format were selected. This might give more meaning and gravity to the paper’s contribution. The related works section is excellent. |

**Methods**: Are the methods clearly described? Could another researcher reproduce the results? Are there procedures that can better be represented in form of pseudocode?

|  |
| --- |
| It is not clear to me personally what a downstream task is. Otherwise, it was easy to follow the steps that were outlined. |

**Results**: Are the results presented and interpreted in a meaningful manner? Is the link and reference to data provided? Are the necessary metadata about the dataset provided? Are the baselines introduced and explained? Is the motivation behind the data, baselines, performance metrics clear?

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**Conclusion**: Do the authors link back to the Introduction? Did they deliver the promised contribution? Do they include disadvantages/ discussion points/ future research?

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**Plots**: Can you understand the plots? Does it use a good color scheme? Are the plots black/white proof? Is the text font readable? Do the plots have a correct format (labels on axes, title, legend, etc). Are all figures explained and referred to in text? Are the captions undertandable?

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

**References**: Are there any claims that require a reference? Are there any errors in the bibliography?

|  |
| --- |
| There are references in the paper. All the major algorithms and datasets seem to be referenced properly. The “Missions “section in the “Related work” section as well as the first paragraph of the introduction have important information that is not referenced. |