Name : Yang, Po-Yen
Student ID : 20561878

Group 1

1. Summary of the report
   Cai Shizhan and Song Wenxin are working on the text classification project entitled "The Disaster Tweets - Text Classification" to detect disasters from Twitter. The data preprocessing they performed included removing URLs and special characters, lemmatizing, tokenizing, removing stop words and joining, and adding CLS and SEP. Also, they decided not to use keywords as it usually appears in text as well, and they didn't use location as around ⅓ of the location values are missing. The methods that they used are RoBERTa and XLNet. For the RoBERTa model, the training accuracy is 0.8, and the Kaggle score is 0.81458. As for the XLNet model, the training accuracy is 0.92, and the Kaggle score is 0.82041. They then gave a brief conclusion and also some limitations of the model and their dataset along with their references and contributions at the end.

2. Strengths of the report
   (1) They did explain how the model works, gave the reasons why they chose the two models and also did a comparison between the two models they used.
   (2) They have put some graphs for visualization.
   (3) Lastly, they talked about the limitations of the XLNet model and their dataset.

3. Weaknesses of the report
   (1) They only provide a short conclusion but didn't give some analysis or which part can be improved in the future.
   (2) The graphs for the model are too small and I can't see it clearly, so is the flow chart of data processing.
   (3) They did not talk about the parameters of their models and only gave the result, and there are no graphs for their result.

4. Evaluation on quality of writing (3)
   I think the report is clearly written as it did express their thoughts clearly, and there were some figures for visualization and there were no typos, also they have discussed the limitations of the XLNet and their dataset. I think the parts that this report can improve are as follows :
   (1) They could add the parameters that they used for both of their models, and also put some graphs regarding their results.
   (2) They could add some analysis or how it can be improved in the future at the very last to make the report more complete.
   (3) The graphs for the models can be larger as there are still some white spaces in the lower left part of the poster.

5. Evaluation on presentation (4)
   The presentation was well organized, and the language flow was fluent for the first person. The slides were also clear and well prepared as they used lots of graphs and

screenshots for visualization. Additionally, they provided clear details of the models they used, and showed lots of comparisons which made it clearer for the audiences to understand. However, there are some points that I think he can improve, which are as follows :

(1) The second speaker seemed to be a bit nervous as he was a bit stuck during the presentation.
(2) I would advise that maybe they can use more different colors to highlight important parts as I only notice a few highlighted points in different colors.

6. Evaluation on creativity (4)
   I think the work did propose new ideas, as they have utilized RoBERTa and XLNet models, and text classification is one of the current hot topics for research recently. I do think that RoBERTa and XLNet can be counted as one of the state-of-the-art results, additionally, the accuracy for the XLNet is relatively good and I may want to utilize the parameters of his XLNet model or even try the XLNet-Large-Cased model, which I think is an extension of existing ideas.

7. Confidence on my assessment (3)
   I have carefully read the paper and checked the results.