IR report review 2

Anon

1 Does the project report answer correctly the project questions? What errors did you notice?

The report makes conclusions based on the findings, but the conclusions are never explained. It does however clearly answer the project questions, but how the conclusions is made, is still hard to understand

2 Does the project report answer all project questions? Which questions are not answered?

Many answers are still left unanswered. Many comparisons have not been concluded.

3 Does the project report break the project guidelines (e.g. regarding submission format, sections, etc.)? Which broken guidelines did you notice?

The report follow the project guidelines, apart from some missing article reviews.

4 Are there portions of the project report unrelated to the project questions? (For example, are there unnecessary summaries or sections of apparent padding?)

There is no irrelevant sections, but the **Experiments** section include a lot of extra padding. I believe it is possible to reduce the padding, by presenting some results together in tables.

5 Are there sufficient examples to support the authors points?

It's hard to find the connection between the author's conclusion and the experiments section. Maybe split up the experiments section to give it more structure?

6 Is the overall organization of the project report clear and effective? Did you feel lost at any point?

There are tons of tables clustered together, and have the same description. It's hard to understand what the difference is.

7 What are the project reports main strengths?

All conclusions are based on numbers presented in the report

8 What are the project reports main weaknesses?

The numbers presented in the report are very messy, and are hard to navigate through

9 What specific recommendations can you make concerning the revision of this project report?

Split up the experiments section. Make more structure. Maybe split up the data generation parts and the conclusions you make.

10 Summarise the (a) technical quality, (b) presentation quality, and (c) adequacy of citation and acknowledgement of related work.

a,b The report is based on a strong technical ground, but it is presented poorly.

c There is only the original reference.