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|  |  |  |  |  |
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Summary:

They have done a great work overall. Clearly they have spent time on it and carefully read the paper. They have carefully replicated the paper settings, and tested on different parameters.

Strengths:

Very detailed technical implementation spent enough time to understand the reason behind each setting and layers, also played around the metrics well.

Weaknesses:

The language is a bit lengthy. Many paragraphs are simply rephrasing what paper is doing. A better way is to highlight what you have done on top of the paper rather than re-writing every detail of the paper. The quality rather than the length is more important.

Clarity and writing:

As mentioned in the weakness part, the language and the main actions can be more clear but shorter but clearer writing. But I can see from their report that they understood the paper well.

Technical quality:

They have tried to use different parameters and settings, which is good. Will be even better if they explain more clearly about why they use certain parameters to try.