

PEER REVIEW FORM

Overall assessment.

	weak	satisfactory	strong
Contents <ul style="list-style-type: none">• covering• relevance			X
Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• guiding the reader• flow of ideas• type-setting and spelling		X	
Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none">• credibility• correctness		X	
Overall effectiveness		X	

Specific comments on contents. The report was very well written in general. All the questions that needed to be addressed were covered. A quick theoretical review behind each of the problem was also very helpful.

Specific comments on presentation. Overall, the report was written very well. A few minor grammatical errors are present which could be corrected. For eg: in section 1.2 "As the target is moving, it can be detected" can be transformed to "The moving target is/was detected.....". The axes of the graphs could have been labelled to make it easier for the reader to interpret and understand.

Specific comments on evidence. The modelling and assumptions were well explained and motivated. The weight degeneration in the SIS algorithm seems to be a bit slower than expected. A plot for the log-likelihood vs the standard deviation/variance would have been helpful to visualize the optimal value.