Summary of the report

• Describe the strengths of the report.

The report demonstrates and explains technical details well. Implementation codes are attached with results, which is helpful for understanding and self-explanatory. Besides, the logic flow of the report is quite fluent. The report includes thorough introduction, clear methodology description, implementation details, conclusion, and a discussion for future works. All sections are well written.

• Describe the weaknesses of the report

The formatting could be further improved, especially how codes are merged with the report text.

• 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 overall technical descriptions of the report is correct and professional. However, there are still a few typos. For example, in the first line, the word “importance” is mistakenly spelled as “importance”. Future reports may require more reviews and proof-reading.

• 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 sections of the report demonstrate substantial work and good understanding of the covered concepts. The figures are pretty self-explanatory, especially those figures presenting the visualization of the features.

• 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