

Peer Review For Group 5

Project 2. MATH 4995

Group Number: 5

Title: Workers Supervision for Construction Safety

Summary of the report

The report continues to use the dataset and similar questions proposed in the mini project. This project aims to create model for detection on safety helmet and safety jacket. Processing techniques such as fisheye distortion is being used. Models such as RAPiD is used. Different quantitative results are used to analyse performance.

Strengths of the report

The report shows some findings that are extended from the previous report. The flow of the prediction is clear, from detecting workers to detecting safety equipment. Different figures are used to support the reasoning and to assist in understanding the report.

Weaknesses of the report

Many of the methodology and references shown actually exist from the previous mini project. While it is understandable that quite an amount of the usage is necessary to further the understanding, it might be great to include more types of model.

Evaluation on quality of writing: 4.5

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.

Everything written is in detail. The flow is understandable. However, the readability might be slightly lower, while compare with different groups. The readability is still very high though. It might be useful to add in more images and visual/word explanations along with the images so that the image could in fact "tell a story".

Evaluation on presentation: 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.

The presentation is very understandable and actually help me a lot on understanding the flow of the report. The flow is organized and it assisted in understanding and provided more explanations on the report as well.

Evaluation on creativity: 3

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.

Quite an amount of the report have demonstrated creativity on usage of certain algorithm. The usage of those models are appropriate. However, as quite an amount of the information is

mentioned on the mini project, which might lead to the amount of new things discovered this time is not as much as previous, though it is understandable as the difficulty would be drastically increased.

Overall rating: 4.5

(5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2- below average. 1- a poorly written one).

Confidence on your assessment: 2

(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)

I have read through the repository and the report. However, as I could not rewatch the presentation and the presentation slides are unavailable, it is quite hard to check details relating the presentation by memory and notes jotted.

