Summary of the report

• Describe the strengths of the report.

The report provides a thorough evaluation on current mainstream feature extraction method, including scattering net, AlexNet, VGG19, and ResNet 18, which are pretty representative deep learning methods. The wide coverage of tested networks makes the comparison and the final conclusion more convincing.

• Describe the weaknesses of the report

The explanation of the cross validation process is not quite clear. Averaging three results for one estimation seems more like a voting mechanism rather than cross validation.

• Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5): Is the report clearly written? Is there a good use of examples and figures? Is it well organized? Are there problems with style and grammar? Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.? Please make suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper, and provide details of typos

4

The report presents essential figures and tables in a clear manner. The figures of PCA vs. t-SNE are pretty self-explanatory. However, a few typos still exist. For example, in the first line of the “Feature Extraction” section, the word “Give” should be “Given”.

• Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): Are the results technically sound? Are there obvious flaws in the reasoning? Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental results? Are the experiments well thought out and convincing? Will it be possible for other researchers to replicate these results? Is the evaluation appropriate? Did the authors clearly assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their approach? Are relevant papers cited, discussed, and compared to the presented work?

5.

The technical section of the report demonstrates extensive work and good understanding of related concepts. Relevant literature are cited correctly.

• Overall rating: (5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2- below average. 1- a poorly written one)

4

• Confidence on your assessment (1-3) (3- I have carefully read the paper and checked the results, 2- I just browse the paper without checking the details, 1- My assessment can be wrong)

3