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**Summary**
Summarize the topic, main intentions, and key messages of the paper and shortly describe the structure of the text. Conclude with a brief statement of your evaluation of the text (positive, negative, or mixed). You can add a limited number of examples. The length of the summary should be approximately half a page.

**Detailed Comments**
Explain your criticism in more detail, e.g.:
- quality of the explanations
  - Does the main message come across?
  - Was the readability/understandability of the paper good and if not, why?
  - Were the figures helpful and all labels etc. readable?
  - Did captions of figures and tables allow to understand the content the figure or table?
- structure
  - Was the structure suitable and if not, why? (correct/intuitive order, useful abstract and conclusions, etc.)
  - Was the layout suitable and all text readable?
- consistency of the presentation
  - Was the notation consistent throughout the paper?
  - Were the formulas correct and all symbols defined before their first usage?
  - Have contents taken from literature been cited correctly?
- language and spelling
  - What about the linguistic quality? Give hints on consistently occurring errors, typos (only some examples), grammatical problems, incomplete sentences, …
  - and other aspects you might find worth mentioning