

## Group 2

- Summary of the report.

This project attempts to analyze the raw images using CNN-based models and metadata using regression of thousands of pet profiles to predict the Pawpularity of pets in attempt to alleviate the burden on animal welfare groups and help stray dogs and cats find caring families, creating a win-win scenario.

- Describe the strengths of the report.
  - The report describes in detail the methods used in each type of data.
  - The report maintains in general high coherence and cohesion throughout every sections.
- Describe the weaknesses of the report.
  - The report should be written in more proper and formal format.
  - Lack of elaboration for figures used
- Evaluation on quality of writing (1-5): Is the report clearly written? Is there a good use of examples and figures? Is it well organized? Are there problems with style and grammar? Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.? Please make suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper, and provide details of typos.

4. Evaluation is as follow and Group 2 can improve based on this

- The report is somewhat clearly written and moderately well-organized.
  - Some examples and figures added into the report are lack of information.
- Evaluation on presentation (1-5): Is the presentation clear and well organized? Are the language flow fluent and persuasive? Are the slides clear and well elaborated? Please make suggestions to improve the presentation.

4. Evaluation is as follow and Group 2 can improve based on this

- The presentation is generally clear, well organized, and aligned with the report.
  - The language flow is fluent and persuasive yet the pace is a bit too fast that makes the presentation hard to follow.
- Evaluation on creativity (1-5): Does the work propose any genuinely new ideas? Is this a work that you are eager to read and cite? Does it contain some state-of-the-art results? As a reviewer you should try to assess whether the ideas are truly new and creative. Novel combinations, adaptations or extensions of existing ideas are also valuable.

4. Evaluation is as follow

- The work doesn't propose any genuinely new idea.
  - The second part of the work is quite interesting to read.
- Confidence on your assessment (1-3) (3- I have carefully read the paper and checked the results, 2- I just browse the paper without checking the details, 1- My assessment can be wrong)
2. I just browse the paper without checking the details