Summary of the report

• Describe the strengths of the report.

They fine tuned the network which is a highlight of this project. The performance is quite great. In their analysis part, they provided a very good and unique explanation of the reason why finetune performs better than adding an unsupervised classifier directly.

• Describe the weaknesses of the report

The number of methods they compared is limited.

• 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

They have a lot of typos, for example, in analysis t-SNE part, it should be “in details”, not “in detailed”. It would be better if this group could transform their report into PDF.

• 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

Their finetune work is great! It improves the performance a lot, rendering the performance better than other projects.

• 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)

5

• 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