**G8: Physics-guided energy-efficient path selection: a summary of results**

**Technical accuracy of the review**

The reviewers did commendable work in reviewing and explaining the status-quo and the need for the development of a novel algorithm for finding the energy-efficient path. All the areas of the review i.e. problem statement, significance, assumptions, etc are well equipped with information for the reader to understand the paper. The validation methodology section can be improved by briefly summarizing the results obtained from the comparison between the methods. For example, in its current form, the validation methodology section simply mentions different methods were compared but doesn’t explicitly say what were the outputs.

**Presentation**

Maybe some parts of the presentation can be extended. No additional information is needed, the same information from the narrative can be used. The reviewers missed out on the important detail on the presentation which they had listed in the narrative i.e. the algorithm doesn’t provide the most efficient path but rather promises not providing an energy-inefficient path.

**Analysis and Insights**

Some great insights are provided in the review. For example, setting different scenarios for different times of the day rush hour and non-rush hours seems a reasonable setup to test the algorithm.

**Improvements**

We would like to suggest the following improvements:

* Adding more details on the validation methodology section about the outcome of the comparison results might be helpful.
* Adding shortcoming of the current approach that it fails to provide the most efficient path.
* Some discussions about the computation cost may be added in the revision/future work section.
* Briefly explain the used terminologies such as “trajectory aware path”
* Please provide appropriate references to the figures used, for example, the scatter plot on the challenge section of the presentation should be properly cited since it’s coming from a study.

**G10: A TIMBER Framework for Mining Urban Tree Inventories Using Remote Sensing Datasets**

**Technical accuracy of the review**

The review of the paper is very detailed with elaborated sections on the problem statement and assumptions. Fewer grammatical errors are there but are not scientific flaws. In the narrative, the major contributions and key concepts section do not fit the description provided there. Some of the sentences are confusing such as “The filtering phase processes the possible candidates of tree locations and eliminates if the location is likely to be habitable for a tree” which might be reworded to improve readability.

**Presentation**

The presentation looks great with appropriate figures utilized in the respective sections. The downside that we see is that sentences on the presentation file are very long that can be changed to short and concise ones. Although reviewers have extensively explained the revision section in the narrative, no such section appears on the presentation slide.

**Analysis and Insights**

The insights by the reviewer are commendable. For example, using CNN exclusively and comparing the results can be an asset to the paper if added. But there exist some sentences which are a bit vague. Such as “these assumptions can be further explored”. Perhaps adding more to this part would make things more clear.

**Improvements**

We would like to suggest the following improvements:

* Swapping the titles of major contributions and Key concepts in the narrative.
* Addition of project revision section on the PowerPoint slide.
* Use of short and concise sentences on the slides.
* May mention the lesser computationally demanding models on the slides where they suggest authors didn’t even consider the other options.
* Perhaps the bullet points presented in the conclusion section would be more suitable in the results section