Group 03

1. Yes
The code is executable.

2. Well documented
The code is well documented.

3.
The code is quite readable, featuring sufficient comments and well-organized sections. The team provided examples illustrating the impact of their functions, effectively demonstrating the changes. I found reading through their code to be a pleasant experience. Additionally, the model performances appear to be quite satisfactory.

4. Nothing to improve
The code is well done.

5. Yes
They elaborated on the lab report's required points.

6.
They experimented with optimizer, learning rate, layer sizes, number of filters, stride, kernel size and pooling.

7. Yes
Train Loss: 0.0134, Train Acc: 0.9991
Val Loss: 0.7771, Val Acc: 0.7692
Test Loss: 0.5445, Test Acc: 0.8178, Test F1 Score: 0.8844

8. Yes
Test Loss: 0.5883, Test Acc: 0.8160, Test F1 Score: 0.7672

9. Partially
The explanations are presented in a general context rather than highlighting their best result. For instance, they mention, "if the learning rate is too high..." and "if the learning rate is too low..." instead of specifying the optimal learning rate from their experiments, which was found to be 0.001. It would be more informative to explicitly mention the learning rate that yielded the best results and explain the rationale behind it, such as the drawbacks of a relatively higher learning rate (0.01).

10.
The report is well-structured, addressing all questions with clarity. To enhance readability, the team employs bold fonts and bullet points, effectively highlighting key points. Additionally, they provide citations for the original questions before presenting their responses.

11.
To further improve clarity, it might be better to include numerical labels before each of the four questions.

12. Yes

13. 1
Overall, the group did a very good job. All requirements are met. The code is both executable and clear, delivering satisfactory performance. The report effectively covers all questions posed. While there is room for improvement in the explanation of optimal parameters, it doesn't pose a significant issue. Considering the group's completion of the assignment, I would assign them a grade of 1.