**Length of paper:**

In Luke’s review of Topic detection using paragraph vectors to support active learning in systematic reviews, he summarized and described in a easy way about the systematic reviews scope and its uses at different places like clinical and public health areas. The original review article is 7 pages long and very technical, with many mathematical equations and algorithms, and Luke did a good job to explain this paper into a good review of its important and major points. He divided the paper into various sections, starting from Into, overview, Process, Measurement and then results relating back to the original paper.

**Depth of Understanding:**

Luke does well at explaining the general concepts of systematic reviews that are performed to glean information from a wide range of papers and its larger scope of uses in the papers which takes lot of time in prescreening process, and he does well in explaining the prescreening tools that has been developed using machine learning to group cluster of articles, He then divided his paper in different sections and each section described about the process of prescreening, then how to measure and presented the results.

**Completeness:**

Luke completely go through the paper described and reviewed very well entirely, not missed any important points of the paper, He covered very well all those prescreening process in very easy manner. He also supported his paper with some other articles related with this paper included in the reference.

**Difficulty:**

The review chosen is completely technical and conceptual as one who don’t have any background of machine learning might have difficulty in understanding all the concepts as It discussed many equations and measures which is bit difficult to understand who don’t have knowledge and background related with those topics. I had a bit difficulty in understanding the results of his COPD dataset and cooking skill dataset as the result looks very interesting, but I didn’t understood much from it.

**Comprehensiveness:**

It covered all the topics presented in the original paper. However, some of the equations should have been included and explained which are missed from original paper. It would have been fully comprehensive If he would have included some of the equations and explain it from the topic detection by clustering paragraph vectors and including topic descriptors.

**Clarity:**

The overall review of the paper was entirely clear, with no major grammatical errors that gives reader a complete understanding about the paper. The paper was divided into different sections that summarized very well throughout the paper. The figures and equations provided helped, perhaps if more explanations were included it would have been more beneficial and understanding for the reader.