Presented group: 1

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: discussed topic of LSTM stock forecasting well. Gave examples of predictions of stock prices and put data into a graph.

Improvement: front end is too simple (only a title and text box that are not centered). Text is much smaller than the figures making it difficult to read. Gives statistics without explaining what it means for the model.

Presented group: 3

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 4

Done well: Specific application but takes into accounts multiple possibilities. Presenter speaks well and easy to understand. Front end looks well made.

Improvement: 70 percent accuracy. Graphs could have clearer labeling.

Presented group: 4

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: 98% accuracy when detecting fake jobs.

Improvement jobs. Difficult to hear and metrics are not formatted well in the slides.

Presented group: 5

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 4

Done well: They went through each step of the process really clearly in an understandable manner. Discussed enough information about the topic.

Improvement: The overall accuracy for the model was pretty low. Information is a bit clustered together and hard to see. Demo is done on a notebook

Presented Group: 05

Your Group Number:

Name: Trader

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite   Neutral   Very interesting

1   2   3   (4)   5

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite   Neutral   Very well

1   2   3   4   (5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete   Neutral   Complete

1   2   3   4   (5)

What went well:

- They tried different models (RNN, GRU)
- Interesting topic → Image Tampering in medical images

What could be improved:

- Accuracy was quite low (90% -) only

Presented group: 6

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 5

Done well: trained 2000 models and well made front end. Unique topic about pokemon

Improvement: difficult to see the data

<u>**Presented Group:**</u> 6

<u>**Your Group Number:**</u> 8

<u>**Name:**</u> TeacherGuhng

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite   Neutral   Very interesting

1   2   3   4   (5)

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite   Neutral   Very well

1   2   3   4   (5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete   Neutral   Complete

1   2   3   4   (5)

What went well:

- Presentation quality
- Slides are well-made
- Technique (generative models) is interesting
- Answered detail questions

What could be improved:

Presented group: 7

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Multiple models in front-end. Good poster with concise information. Strong reflection on potential improvements. 98% accuracy for Spam detection.

Improvement: Need to be louder for presentation. Could take into consideration context.

Presented Group: 8

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Brian Tom, Teaden Gurung

The project motivation was interesting: 4

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How well was the presentation delivered? 5

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How complete was the project? 5

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	5

What went well: The graphs and figures nicely showed what was going on.

 Good quality presentations, very detailed and gives good overview of project

- Good figures and visuals
- models are easy to see.

What could be improved: It wasn't the clearest how each song was classified

- Methods felt too simplistic
- needs more models.

Presented group: 9

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 4

Done well: Good graphics on poster. Tried multiple models. Description of methodology.

Improvement: Were unable to achieve high accuracy, lacking demo.

Presented group: 10

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Concise poster. Transparent about challenges.

Improvement: Explanation of model was a little unclear.

Presented group: 11

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 5

Done well: graphs are used well in presentation. Classifying links into sensible categories. Used multiple models.

Improvement: front end is difficult to see.

Presented group: 12

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: unique topic about job posting and graphs are easy to see.

Improvement: 85% accuracy on the model

Presented group: 13

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 4

Done well: Different types of visualization for data. Front end is simple and easy to use. Chat GTP for creating recommendations. Text analysis is interesting in context.

Improvement: Hard to see data in multiple graphs.

Presented Group: 14

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Brian Tom

The project motivation was interesting: 4

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How well was the presentation delivered? 5

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How complete was the project? 5

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	5

What went well:

- They had several different models/encoding methods available, and the demo was clear

What could be improved:

- Maybe they could do more with the processed data

Presented group: 15

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: predictor of type 2 diabetes with simple front end that is easy to use. Multiple models for getting data.

Improvement: most data is a binary data which would does not get information for frequency. 80 accuracy with naive bayes and KNN to get data.

Presented Group: Group 16

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Faizan Haque

The project motivation was interesting: 5

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**<u>5</u>**

How well was the presentation delivered? 4

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**<u>5</u>**

How complete was the project? 4

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	**<u>5</u>**

What went well:

- Good poster
- Analysis of multiple models
- well explained and easy to see

What could be improved:

- Presenter could be louder
- stats do not really make sense.

Presented group: 17

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 5

Done well: 99.9% accuracy with naive bayes theorem

Improvement: difficult to tell what neural net they used

Presented Group: 17

Your Group Number: 18

Name: Teaden Guring

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	(5)

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	(5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	(5)

What went well:

- Presented well, and answered in-depth questions

- Interesting problem

- Good front-end

What could be improved:

- Could be louder

Presented group: 19

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: 91% accuracy with svm model for academic success predictor. 4000 data points to train model.

Improvement: too much text in slides. Hard to hear what they are saying.

Presented Group: 20

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Brian Tom

The project motivation was interesting: 5

How well was the presentation delivered? 4

How complete was the project? 4

What went well: It was very clear how the bot worked.

What could be improved: The bot died fairly often right at the start.

Presented Group: 20

Your Group Number: 18

Name:

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	5

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	5

What went well: — has a slide for further improvement
— Google dinosaur game RL, very interesting

What could be improved:
— Better figures / showcase of training

Presented group: 21

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 4

Done well: trained the car scammer model with over 4000 cars. Multiple models used with random forest performing the best.

Improvement: models are difficult to read. Does not provide specific numbers for accuracy.

Presented Group: 22

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Brian Tom

The project motivation was interesting: 5

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How well was the presentation delivered? 4

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	5

How complete was the project? 5

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	5

What went well:

- The demo was pretty good at showcasing what their project was about
- good interaction and well made website

What could be improved:

- There were two separate presentations which was slightly confusing at first
- hard to see laptops

Presented group: 23

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: front end is simple for inputting spam emails into model. 98% accuracy with svm model.

Improvement: hard to hear some points made.

Presented group: 24

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 5

Done well: lots of clear looking graphs and figures. Talked about some things they could've done to improve accuracy

Improvement: demo could've used actual shows

<u>**Presented Group:**</u> 24

<u>**Your Group Number:**</u> 18

<u>**Name:**</u> Teader Guerung

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	(4)	5

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	(5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	(5)

What went well:

- Well-presented
- Talked about data processing

What could be improved:

- Methods used felt simplistic and quite similar to HW

Presented group: 26

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: graphs are easy to understand. Accuracy is better using different models.

Improvement: hard to hear some details.

Presented group: 27

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 4

Done well: Analysis of multiple models. Interesting demo. ANN had the best result for predicting emotion in speech.

Improvement: Weren't able to achieve high accuracy.

Presented Group: 27

Your Group Number: 18

Name: Teacher Gunny

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	(4)	5

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	(5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	(5)

What went well:

- They showed results of multiple model techniques
- Good interesting topic

What could be improved:

Presented group: 28

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 4

Done well: unique topic about google play store installs.

Improvement: Graph is a mess of data points. Multiple data tables that are difficult to see.

Presented group: 29

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Contrasted different approaches for recommender systems. Front end is simple and easy to understand.

Improvement: Add more graphical variety in the poster.

Presented Group: Group 30

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Faizan Haque

The project motivation was interesting: 5

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**5**

How well was the presentation delivered? 4

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**5**

How complete was the project? 4

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	**5**

What went well:

- Good poster
- Demo is well constructed
- Analysis of multiple models
- slides and data are easy to read.

What could be improved:

- Project topic is common
- input boxes are hard to see.

Presented group: 31

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Multiple models compared. Clear poster. Unique topic about league of legends.

Improvement: Could have more thorough presentation of project. 93% accuracy on logistic regression.

<u>Presented Group:</u> 31

<u>Your Group Number:</u> 18

<u>Name:</u> Teader

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	(5)

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	(5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	(5)

What went well:

- Unique topic
- Multiple different techniques
- Had good demo

Presented group: 32

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Effectively detailed different models. Solid demo design.

Improvement: Poster could be clearer. Demo could have more data. Demo could have less text boxes and be easier to read.

Presented Group: 32

Your Group Number: 18

Name: Teader Gurung

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	(4)	5

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very well
1	2	3	4	(5)

How complete was the project?

Incomplete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	(5)

What went well:

- Poster is very detailed & well-made
- Front-end looks good

What could be improved:

- More details on data processing

Presented group: 33

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: front end and presenter slides are well made. 88 percent accuracy.

Improvement: old data set used for came classifiers. Data tables are very hard to see.

Presented group: 34

Project motivation: 4

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 5

Done well: choose SL and ANN model for portfolio picker. Understands the limitations of the model.

Improvement: Too much text in slides and hard to read.

Presented Group: Group 35

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Faizan Haque

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**5**

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite		Neutral		Very interesting
1	2	3	4	**5**

How complete was the project?

Not Complete		Neutral		Complete
1	2	3	4	**5**

What went well:

- Good layout of poster
- Discussed challenges effectively
- provided good figures and easy to understand. Figures are easy to see and images are well picked.

What could be improved:

- Text is a dense
- Figures are a little difficult to see. Too much information in one slide.

Presented group: 36

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 5

Completed: 4

Done well: Well constructed and clear demo.

Improvement: Could've implemented a way to do it on images without a black background. Hard to hear what they are saying.

<u>Presented Group:</u> 36

<u>Your Group Number:</u> 18

<u>Name:</u> Teader Gurung

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite   Neutral   Very interesting

1   2   3   4   **(5)**

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite   Neutral   Very well

1   2   3   **(4)**   5

How complete was the project?

Incomplete   Neutral   Complete

1   2   3   **(4)**   5

What went well:

- Presentation was simple & straight to the point
- Good design

What could be improved: talk more +

- Could add More details like training process

Presented Group: Group 37

Your Group Number: Group 18

Name: Faizan Haque

The project motivation was interesting:

Not quite   Neutral   Very interesting

1   2   3   4   **<u>5</u>**

How well was the presentation delivered?

Not quite   Neutral   Very interesting

1   2   3   4   **<u>5</u>**

How complete was the project?

Not Complete   Neutral   Complete

1   2   3   4   **<u>5</u>**

What went well:

- Well-designed demonstration
- Presenter spoke well
- Detailed challenges well
- formation is good.

What could be improved:

- Poster is hard to read

Presented group: 38

Project motivation: 5

Presentation delivered: 4

Completed: 5

Done well: Detailed challenges and development of model.

Improvement: Could be more concise in communicating information.