Peer review for Lab 1 TSRT78: ID A-35102

To start off, the report was well written. Most of the methods and goals are defined and would be possible to replicate using only the report alone. The theory section might be slightly long and could probably be shortened down as you could assume that the reader has some basic prior knowledge. However it is good to define the different physicalities that you have used, which you did well.

For the whistle task everything is well defined and it is easy to follow what you have done just from reading the text. If anything a figure illustrating the poles relative to the unit circle might have been interesting. Another thing that may have been interesting is to justify the choice of model order 2 by looking at the loss function for different order numbers but you have justified it enough.

For the vowel task everything is once again well defined but the figures 4 and 5 seem slightly glossed over. It would be very helpful to write out what was looked for in the validation plots and what they actually represent instead of just writing that these are the validation plots for the chosen model orders. Is it not interesting that the epsilon plot for vowel a is not normally distributed like in the o plot? At least make a comment about what it should be and maybe an educated guess to what is happening to the epsilon. A legend would also be nice for the bode plots for the vowels' spectrums. The task also asks of you to "Validate more than one model order and then motivate your choice of model order" which you may or may not have done outside of the report but it is something that you should include and discuss around in the actual report as well.

For the GSM task there is not a lot to comment about. The method was good and the results seemed good. If anything is to be commented on it would be that the compression rate should have been calculated on an AR(8) model since that was the actual task. The conclusion however stays the same and was well backed up by the results.

All in all the report is very thorough and easy to read and replicate. The only issue would be the validation in the vowel task that could easily be fixed by including a couple of sentences on the content of the figures and a comparison to different models.