

PEER REVIEW 1

N/A

PEER REVIEW 2

N/A

PEER REVIEW 3

Agreed that use of graphical tools to compare the models would be more illustrative.

PEER REVIEW 4

If I were to undertake any future experimentation, I would certainly test out CNN ensembling methods and self-attention transformers (perhaps similar to the ones used by Group 7). However, it would be appreciated if concrete feedback could be provided as to how to improve the report/presentation, as the content of the review mainly lists strengths and is inconsistent with the numerical score given.

PEER REVIEW 5

What is meant by “proper and formal format” in the report? (does it refer to the tone of voice?)
Additionally, each figure has been clearly labelled or described in the preceding paragraphs. Would further annotation be required?

The reviewer also says the report is “moderately well organized” and “somewhat clearly written.”
However, this appears to be a subjective assessment. Are there any suggestions that can be made to improve organization/clarity (eg add a table of contents, typos to be amended/additional explanations?)

Understandable that my pacing in the presentation was a little too fast.