

**Speaker:** Anna Sehgal

---

**Reviewer 1 Kevin:** Nice detailed explanation of algorithm. Pseudocode and runtime is well done. I liked the math explanation and how the rankings are decided. Nice addition of limitation to algorithm.

**Reviewer 2 Joanna:** Detailed breakdown of intuition, pseudocode and the algorithm working. Runtime and mathematical process behind it was explained in detail!

**Reviewer 3 (Max):** PageRank algorithm presentation with animated gif of algorithm in motion. Utility of algorithm presented with examples on intuition like random surfer model. Math and code under the hood, such as runtime, shown with explanations.

**Reviewer 4 (Isaac):** The presentation for the PageRank Algorithm is very well done. The usage for showing the math and pseudocode helps with showing the common usage for that algorithm and the details for how it works and the runtime usage it has.

---

**Speaker:** Joanna Rodriguez

---

**Reviewer 1 (Anna Sehgal):** I like how examples were used to explain the algorithm for this presentation, and what PR is. Detailed pseudocode about the algorithm would be helpful for the report.

**Reviewer 2 Kevin:** Great plan and description of algorithm. Pretty in depth of algorithm and its concept. Runtime is  $O(k*m)$  is great!

**Reviewer 3 (Max):** Detailed description of Page Rank algorithm and its application. Runtime of  $O(k*m)$  and other details explained.

**Reviewer 4 (Isaac):** The examples you used for your algorithm are fantastic. The runtime is neat and your detailed explanation for the algorithm is great.

---

**Speaker:** Kevin Xiong

---

**Reviewer 1 (Anna Sehgal):** I liked how the pseudocode was explained and the overall implementation. The algorithm was explained clearly and was understandable. One suggestion would be to write the pseudocode in the format we learned in class for the report.

**Reviewer 2 Joanna:** Algorithm and implementation was easy to follow and understand, great progress thus far!

**Reviewer 3 (Max):** Good presentation and clear direction on how to apply the chosen algorithm into code. Runtime was made clear and compared to other possible choices.

**Reviewer 4 (Isaac):** The presentation is pretty good, the progress for your implementation is pretty great and the runtime analysis is well done.

---

**Speaker:** Max

---

**Reviewer 1 (Anna Sehgal):** Good process made so far on the code. I like how the presentation was about audio, which is a pretty interesting algorithm to explore. For the report, having pseudocode would be helpful to guide the reader along with a runtime analysis part.

**Reviewer 2 Joanna:** Great amount of work done so far, lots of code/testing done. Runtime analysis tested

**Reviewer 3 Kevin:** Good work done. I think you have a solid plan and the concept is interesting. Presentation is good and the runtime is good as well.

**Reviewer 4 (Isaac):** The work you put in is great so far, you put a lot of thought and effort into your project. Your presentation is good and the runtime for your project is great

---

**Speaker:** Isaac

---

**Reviewer 1 (Anna Sehgal):** Great explanation about the usage of A\*. I like the pseudocode explanation. A detailed explanation of heuristics shows overall understanding of the algorithm. No recommendations from my end, but I was able to understand the algorithm well through the pseudocode and explanation.

**Reviewer 2 Joanna:** Very detailed pseudocode, and great concept/plan set. Heuristics explained and importance in A\*.

**Reviewer 3 Kevin:** Explanation of algorithm is great. Pseudocode is detailed and well explained. Heuristics is explained in detail and why it is important. Runtime is exponential  $O(b^d)$ .

**Reviewer 4 (Max):** Lots of code and concepts detailedly explained.