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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.

|  |
| --- |
| Text makes sense most of the time. There were a few inconsistencies with the referencing. Little to no typos. Sentences are complete. Maybe add a bit more structure and take the reader more by the hand. |

**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 precisely and briefly describes what the paper does. Some results should be added as well. |

**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 ‘why’ is missing. I can imagine cloud removal can be useful in other scenarios than land classification. What could the results show? Maybe that we can classify land using cloudy satellite images?  In research question 1 you talk about ‘pristine cloudy images’, what does this mean? Are they with clouds or without clouds? In the abstract you mention ‘pristine and cloudy’ as if they are opposite of each other.  Related work:  Related work needs more structure. It can be a bit confusing for the reader. It starts about the original paper and then without introduction starts describing other methods. Also maybe make a bit clearer here that ‘DSen2-CR’ is the method from the paper. Take the reader more by the hand. |

**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 needs more elaboration. Maybe add a diagram to make your method more transparent.  What I find confusing about the method is that you start by training a model on a different dataset (without clouds) and then use this model on both cloudless and cloudy images. Wouldn’t this model then be biased towards cloudless images? I think this concerns research question 1. ->  Maybe emphasize more that you expect a loss in accuracy, you are interested by how much the accuracy will deteriorate when using images of which clouds have been removed compared to images without clouds at all. |

**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?

|  |
| --- |
| - |

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

|  |
| --- |
| - |

**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?

|  |
| --- |
| Referencing is inconsistent. Sometimes [6] is used and sometimes [Meraner] is used. |