

# **Summary:**

Firstly, we appreciate all classmates, professor, and tutors for carefully reading our group's report and also thanks for their suggestions. We carefully go through the summary, strengths, and weaknesses raised by our classmates. The average overall rating for our group project is 4.5, while the highest is 5 and the lowest is 4. As for the deficiencies, here are our responses.

## **Responses:**

### **Peer Review 1**

Our classmate mentioned that it would be better for us to print a summary table with figures that indicate the performance of the model in different settings. We agree that this is a great and useful advice. And below is the summary table.

	Without Xavier				With Xavier		
<b>Batch Size</b>	32	64	128	128	128	128	128
<b>Drop Out</b>	0	0	0	0.25	0.5	0.5	0.5
Learning Rate	1.00E-03	1.00E-03	1.00E-03	1.00E-03	1.00E-03	1.00E-03	1.00E-05
Train Loss (average)	0.702	0.696	0.632	0.629	0.68	0.622	0.638
Test Loss (average)	0.8	0.77	0.655	0.738	0.72	0.647	0.682

#### **Peer Review 2**

Our classmate mentioned that it would be better for us to add more extensions in our report. Actually, that's a really good advice and we accept this suggestion. Our group will try more in the future following the original report. Thanks~!

## **Peer Review 3**

Our classmate mentioned that it would be better for us to use visualization methods such as heat map. After our discussion, we agree that using visualization is a great method, however, not appropriate for our project in this time.

If the situation is that we need to find a target detection, some specific data frames, or some specific targets, it would be nice to draw a heat map picture. Because that clear and obvious pictures will help our readers to understand our report more easily. However, as for this time, our entire image is full of data features and we are not certain that which of them are useful. As a result, we think this picture may be confusing and will bring no specific effect, maybe we try it next time.