

EECS 542 Final Project Guidelines

Your final project will have three deliverables:

- Proposal (5%)
- Final report (70%), April 22
- Presentations (25%) during the final two days of class

The final report should follow the **CVPR** format (LaTeX template can be downloaded [here](#)). Your report should be no longer than **four pages** (excluding references). Please make sure that it contains the following sections:

1. **Introduction:** Please describe the motivation for your work. Be specific about the problem you are solving. Is it an interesting/significant problem? What are your contributions?
2. **Related work:** What has been done previously? What's the strength/weakness of previous approaches? How are those works connected to the approach you are studying?
3. **Method:** Please describe the details of your approach. If it's about neural network architectures, please include a figure. If it's an algorithm, you may want to include a pseudocode (see [here](#)). Feel free to include both if you feel necessary.
4. **Experiments:** What is the data that you are using? What are the hyperparameters? How is the model evaluated? What are the baseline approaches that you are comparing your method with? How does the performance of your method compare with these baseline methods? Tables and figures are efficient ways to convey your experiment results.
5. **Conclusions:** Please include the most important take-away message. This can be one paragraph about the reproducibility of the work, the strength/weakness of your method compared against baseline methods, and future work that can be done.

We are going to evaluate your report and presentation based on three criteria:

1. **Background** (20%): How is the project related to previous research? What's the relative strength and weakness of the approach studied in your project and related work?
2. **Format and Clarity** (40%): Is the report in CVPR format? Are you using math notations properly? Is the report/presentation easy to follow? Do you clearly explain your method? Have you clearly explained the reasonings for your hypothesis and design choices?

Have you provided enough details in the report for the readers to reproduce your results?

3. **Completeness** (40%): Does the report have all the required sections? Have you successfully reproduced the results from the paper you choose? (if you are testing your own ideas, have you managed to make your approach work?) If not successful, what could be the reasons? Have you done an ablation study to understand each part of the approach? Note that, though you should strive to get good and interesting results, it's OK if you couldn't completely reproduce the results from the chosen paper or outperform baseline approaches with your proposed method. We will evaluate your work mainly based on the thought process demonstrated in the report/presentation. However, a complete failure to replicate previous results or implement your own ideas will lead to a deduction of points.