CENG 796 - Peer-review form

Reviewed project ID: Group 07

Reviewed project's title (title of the paper): GANSeg: Learning to Segment by Unsupervised Ahmet Kağan Kaya Hierarchical Image Generation

Reviewer name(s): Seyit Semih Yiğitarslan

Instructions:
- Answer = *Yes*, *No* or *Partial*.
- You may expand sections as necessary.
- For most questions, you do not need to add comments, unless the instructions tell you otherwise.
- "Notebook" refers to "Jupyter Notebook" file that is expected to be named as main.ipynb

Question	Answer	Comments
Contains a jupyter notebook file	Yes	
Notebook is located at <project_root>/main.ipynb	Yes	
Notebook's first section contains paper information (paper title, paper authors, and project group members' name & contact information) Some good examples: see group03, group10, group11 (and a couple of other groups).	Yes	The paper title, paper authors, and contact information have been entered.
Notebook contains a section for hyper-parameters of the model.	Yes	
Notebook contains a section for training & saving the model.	Yes	
Notebook contains a section (or a few sections) for loading a pre-trained model & computing qualitative samples/outputs.	Yes	
Notebook contains reproduced plots and/or tables, as declared.	Partial	
Notebook contains pre-computed outputs.	Yes	

Data is included and/or a proper download script is provided.	Yes	
Notebook contains a section describing the difficulties encountered.	Yes	Detailed and Explanatory Description of Challenges The "Challenges Faced" section provides a comprehensive and explanatory account of the difficulties encountered. The explanations regarding both the dataset and the mathematical models further enhance the clarity and comprehensibility..
The paper has achieved its goals and/or explained what is missing.	Yes	
The notebook contains a section that reproduces the figure(s) and table(s) declared in the goals.	Partial	
The notebook also reports the original values of the targeted quantitative results, for comparison.	Yes	
MIT License is included.	Yes	
As the reviewer(s), you have read the paper & understood it.	Yes	
Implementation of the model seems correct.	Yes	* If you have not been able to find any errors , give a list of things that you have been able to match between the paper and the code. (eg. "I have located Eq. 3, 5, 7 and they seem to be corrected implemented.") * Also denote any part that looks possibly problematic. You may use "additional comments" section below for your detailed comments.
Notebook looks professional (in terms of notation, readability, etc.)	Yes	In terms of readability, clarity, and organization, it appears to be professionally presented..
Source code looks professional (in terms of coding style, comments, etc.)	Yes	

Additional comments:

The code appears to be quite professional and in compliance with the requirements, however, it could benefit from adding more comments throughout the code.