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Summary:

The report successfully replicated the original paper and showed their result clearly. It is obvious that the team spared a lot effort in fully understanding the paper and coding, which deserves a fare score. However, to judge a work is well done or not, the report writing part is also important. Directly copy from the original paper is always not a good idea, while I suggest you to state the idea using your own words.

Strengths:

Highly praise the good replication work including but not limited to the model design and performance evaluation. The model performance is clearly stated in the report and easy to understand.

Weaknesses:

For data preparation part, the report copied a lot from the paper. While we can directly get to know the detail information from the paper, I don’t think it is a good idea to repeat it again in the report instead of using original words to summarize the whole idea. (One suggestion is to take a look at how literature review is stated. Since this is just a course report, maybe a list of important points using your own words is enough, compared to the whole copied paragraph.)

Another point is that instead of using ‘we’ for all the parameter choosing in part two, since this is the replication work of the original paper, I suggest you to state clearly what is directly following what the original paper is doing and what is your own selection.

In addition, it is not ‘you’ ‘choose to convert 1D time series into 2D images’, as your reasons are copied from the paper, you just followed the paper. Pay attention to the words using as a rigorous report writing. Not sure if Part one and two are written by one person and part three is written by another teammate. Part three state the work you guys did better than the first two parts.

Lastly, I appreciate your coding work while I suggest you name the coding file according to what the coding is about so that the readers can get a direct sense, or put them together in a one single master file.

Clarity and writing:

There’s a typo about figure number in Part four ‘Portfolio Performance’ part, and another typo also about the figure number in Part five ‘Grad-CAM’ part.

Technical quality:

Perfect.