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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 Readability is fine I would change the experment section to a method section. Seems to be the section heading the graders prefer.  Sentences are complete seems to be you have followed the writing guidliness sent our to the class. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Abstract sumerized but I don’t know a lot of about satillte imagery maybe Sentianel-2 imergery, from euroSAT. Makes it more clear what imagery being used. |

**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.

|  |
| --- |
| I clear what the orignal authors did and its clear what you are doing. I would address or list form challenges you need to overcome. Plus, tell me we are using a differnet algorithm and different data from the paper. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| The method is clear but I would add some more to really how the experment is done. I relize without results Im assuimg you have thought of the method but have no implimented it so I get why a more detailed method section is not included. |

**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?

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

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

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**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?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |