CSC486B/CSC586B Final Project Feedback

Kwang Moo Yi
University of Victoria
Victoria, BC, Canada
kyi@uvic.ca

Abstract

The feedback is written in two parts. I will first discuss about the report, and then the code.

1. Thanks!

First of all, thanks for surviving the semester! As learning continues even after the course ends, here's a final feedback on your final project.

2. Report (100/100)

2.1. Abstract

Well written.

2.2. Introduction

The introduction could also mention some of the highlights of the original paper and your project, giving a high-level overview, although I did not ask for it (no marks deducted here! don't worry). You should always (i) say what you will to say, (ii) say what you want to say, and (iii) say what you have said. A bit of a repetition, but it's like carving away concepts by presenting it in a different view. Much like making a 3D model out of 2D projections from multiple views.

2.3. Contributions of the original paper

Again, all I can say is that it's very well written.

2.4. Contributions of this project

Though simple, you should've also mentioned the parallelism that you introduced to your implementation. Because actually this part involves you completely understanding the flow behind MCTS implementation, which is the core concept that you need to take.

3. Code (95/100)

Although you started from a code base, I see enough modifications and experiments to your code. I'd also suggest releasing the code to public. I prefer your code base much more than the original.

4. Further suggestions

I agree that there's no apparent weakness of the paper. Limitations of the paper would not be the framework but rather how the policy network and the value network is formed. For example, taking into account the temporal consistency of the estimations for temporally continuous tasks, or modelling the adversary could be an interesting approach to take.