Review A

Group 6 `Distributed big data technology' (Total Score = 30)

1. Relevance and timeleness (Score = 5).

The topic is highly related to the course. (+5)The proposal topic is not popular. Some similar concepts have already been studied such as combining `big data' with distributed networks, or distributed computing.

Answer: We have already combined the theory of big data and adversarial example, we want to use random forest to decrease rate of successful attack by adversarial example. Research related with adversarial example is popular. We want to use boyer-moore algorithm to vote to get the best result.

2. Novelty and originality (Score = 5).

The proposal topic is not novel because it has already been studied by a bunch of previous work. The content is in most presented by their own words, the similarity is 0%. (+5)

Answer: Thanks for your comment, and we combined the theory of big data and adversarial example, we want to use random forest to decrease rate of successful attack by adversarial example. Research related with adversarial example is popular. We want to use boyer-moore algorithm to vote to get the best result.

3. Completeness (address the required 5 questions) (Score = 5).

Strength: All required questioned are mentioned respectively, but the writing form does not follow the standard of a proposal (Abstract->Introduction->main content->reference). (+4)Weakness: There is no precise research direction discussed and no state-of-the-art research work summarized in the proposal. Suggestions: i) the topic requires to be more specific for some detailed technical research direction that you are interested and have read; ii) please correct your writing typos and grammar mistakes as much as possible; iii) please read high-quality surveys or other technic papers and cite them when you writing some ideas that require supportive materials.

Answer: Thank you for your advice and we are willing to improve our proposal by this suggestion. We rewrite the content with the standard of a proposal. We find some research and put it into the proposal, such as 'robust and verifiable erasure code for Hadoop distributed file systems' and so on. We try our best to correct our grammar and typo, and improve our English skill. We read some related paper and cited the in the reference.

4. Quality of presentation (Score = 10).

5. Integraty (Score = 5).

Same with the reason for completeness scoring.

Answer: same the answer of completeness.

Review B

Group 6 `Distributed big data technology' (Total Score = 33')

1. Relevance and timeleness (6').

The topic is highly related to the course. but the topic seems not new while the proposal

mentioned deep learning,
if they can make a combination, maybe it will be more popular.
Answer: Thanks for your suggestion about combination. We have already combined the theory of big data and adversarial example, we want to use random forest to decrease rate of successful attack by adversarial example.

2. Novelty and originality (5').
The proposal is not novel as they just stated what they learned or will learn, that is, they retold something others have done
Answer: In order to be novel, we combine the theory of big data and adversarial example to improve performance. The topic is popular to do some research.

3. Completeness (address the required 5 questions) (6').
They answered the required questions but not around what they want to research. It seems they didn't have a core question they want to solve.
Answer: At the beginning of the research, we couldn't find out the core question and didn't write in the proposal. However, we discussed and finally want to do some research about DNN. After reading some paper, we find that it's very easy to trick DNN and get the misclassification. We want to improve the robustness of DNN and get higher correctness of classification.

4. Quality of presentation (9').
There were no references and keywords.
Answer: Thanks for the suggestion and we add reference and keywords in the proposal.

5. Integraty (7').
The similarity was 0% ,in some respect, it is good. However, the authors should have their own ideas and make something new.
Answer: Thanks for your comment. We want to find something new and adversarial example is a good idea. We try to improve the performance with voting and learning. We read some paper and seems no one to try this way. Using training set with adversarial example got different results by different researchers. We don't actually know if there will be a better performance, just want to try and find out the result.

Review C
Group 6 `Distributed big data technology' (Total Score = 28')
1. Relevance and timeliness (1 ~ 10) 5
The topic of this proposal is relevant to the distributed system. However, it is not a new topic recently.
Answer: Thanks for your advice. We finally change the topic and the topic will be popular. We want to do some research about evaluating adversarial example by random forest. We want to improve the performance of reducing the rate of successful attack by voting.

2. Novelty and originality (1 ~ 10) 3

There are many researches on big data with distributed systems. The authors should state clearly what the proposed study is different from the existing studies.

Answer: At the beginning of the research, we couldn't find out the core question and didn't write in the proposal. However, we discussed and finally want to do some research about DNN. After reading some paper, we find that it's very easy to trick DNN and get the misclassification. We want to improve the robustness of DNN and get higher correctness of classification. We want to find something new and adversarial example is a good idea. We try to improve the performance with voting and learning. We read some paper and seems no one to try this way. Using training set with adversarial example got different results by different researchers. We don't actually know if there will be a better performance, just want to try and find out the result.

3. Completeness (Does this report address the required 5 questions) (1 ~ 10) 6

The authors introduce some preliminary knowledge about big data and deep learning. However，it is not clear what problem is proposed to be solved in this project. More technical details should be given.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. After that, we read more paper to know more technical details and put it in the proposal.

4. Quality of presentation (1 ~ 10) 4

There are many language errors. Some references should be listed to support your proposal. The structure of this report is informal, the abstract and the introduction should be given.

Answer: We rewrite the content with the standard of a proposal. We find some research and put it into the proposal, such as 'robust and verifiable erasure code for Hadoop distributed file systems' and so on. We try our best to correct our grammar and typo, and improve our English skill. We read some related paper and cited the in the reference.

5. Integrity (Any plagiarisms) (1 ~ 10) 10

Well done