Review						
Summary	The paper presents techniques for automated 3D scanning. The author begins discussing classic approaches and explains use cases as well as limitations. The classic approaches are discussed firmly and built up until the recent work of Vasquez-Gomez et al. The author moves on to modern approaches based on more advanced learning-based techniques. The learning-based approaches are covered extensively and details are discussed adequately. Overall, the report structure indicates a comparison of classic and modern approaches in automated 3D scanning. With the addition of the last part, this report will provide a good summary and the latest trends in automated 3D reconstruction.					
Clarity of presentation	4: (excellent)					
Methodology	5 : (outstanding)					
Technical soundness	4: (excellent)					
Results	NaN: (NaN)					
Overall evaluation	4: (excellent) Overall very good. Find it very cohesive and informative. On the other hand, there are some long sections both on classical and modern techniques. But, since there is not a page limit this should not be a huge issue. In the worst case, I would trim intermediate results of experiments after you introduce each/some papers. As you will most likely discuss them in the comparison section. Overall very interesting work. A brief revisit of the classical approach would improve the readability. Looking forward to reading the next sections.					
Reviewer's confidence	2 : (low)					

Detailed comments

Major issues:

- 1. The readability. Especially for the classic approaches some sentences are quite lengthy. Occasionally, multiple things are tried to be explained in one sentence. By breaking them apart, you could improve the flow of the text. Interestingly, this seems to be less of an issue for the modern approaches.
- 2. Overall, the figures are in a good state. However, since the paper is written well, some of the figures pop out as they sometimes do not match the overall quality. I believe reproducing some of the figures on your own would make the report even more authentic and would allow you to remove unnecessary white spaces.

Minor issues:

- As you are already using citings, I would preferably remove explicit lengthy paper names and years.

Additional (minor) issues can be found in the reviewed PDF document.