PEER REVIEW FORM

Overall assessment.

	weak	satisfactory	strong

Contents
  • covering
  • relevance
		X	

Presentation
  • guiding the reader
  • flow of ideas
  • type-setting and spelling
	X		

Evidence
  • credibility
  • correctness
		X	

Overall effectiveness		X	

In general, it is a satisfactory work, considering it is done by a single person.

Specific comments on contents.

- The content covers all aspects to be discussed in a concise way.
- The theoritical part (Problem 1 & 2)is self-contained with detailed derivation.
- The code part (Problem 3,4 & 5) only focuses on the result, but does not give any illstration on how to get it or why.

Specific comments on presentation.

- The report is organized by simply giving answers to problems, however, doesn't show the flow of ideas between problems.
- As has been commented, the code part (Problem 3,4 & 5) is lack of detailed illstration, therefore, is far from understandable without access to the code.
- The code should be more organized and needs more comments.

Specific comments on evidence.

- The result is okay in general, both the theoritical part and the code part.
- To be improved, in the maximum likelihood estimation of ς, the step size 0.2 is too large, and should be narrowed to 0.05 or even lower. If there is problem about computing time, it can be first limited to a certain interval and obtained in a progressive way.