

Dear reviewing committee,

On behalf of the UT-DSP team, I would like to thank you for taking the time to read our paper and providing us with your generous remarks. You may find a brief account of the changes we applied to the paper, below.

Yours Sincerely,

Elham Mohammadi
M.Sc. Student, Computational Linguistics
Data and Signal Processing Laboratory ([DSP Lab](#))
Faculty of New Sciences and Technologies ([FNST](#))
University of Tehran ([UT](#)), Tehran, Iran
E-mail: elham.mohammadi@ut.ac.ir
Skype ID: [mohammadi.em72](https://www.skype.com/people/mohammadi.em72)
Contact: +98-936-592-2093

General Feedback

- Clearly identify your team name in your abstract and introduction
 - ✓ It was already mentioned in the abstract, in the sentence “We participated in the NLI Shared Task 2017 under the name UT-DSP”.
 - ✓ We added the sentence “Our team, UT-DSP participated in the NLI Shared Task 2017.” in the Introduction section.
- Please report your best method and results in the abstract
 - ✓ It was already reported in the abstract session, in the sentence “In our effort to implement a method for native language identification, we made use of a mixture of character and word N-grams, and achieved an optimal F1-score of 0.7748, using both essay and speech transcription datasets.”.
- Please standardize the name of the shared task throughout your paper by always referring to it as the "NLI Shared Task 2017"
 - ✓ Done.
- Please refer to the source of the data as "a standardized assessment of English proficiency for

academic purposes" (not "TOEFL")

- ✓ Done.
- Report your results with a precision of 4 decimal places, (e.g. 0.8534)
 - ✓ All percentages have been converted to the decimal format.
- Clearly indicate which results were officially submitted as part of the shared task and which were obtained after the test phase ended. Any results not in the official rankings should be clearly distinguished.
 - ✓ This sentence has been added at the end of the Results section: “All results reported in this section were officially submitted as part of the NLI Shared Task 2017.”
- In addition to the random baseline, you can compare to these official baselines
 - ✓ Done (in the first paragraph of the Discussion section). We did not use the i-vectors, a fact which we also added to the paper.

Specific Comments

- The paper is very short, please add more details where possible.
 - ✓ We added some details to the Methodology and Discussion sections.
- Why is there no "Related Work" section? We had provided the details for this in the template that was included with your results package.
 - ✓ We separated the Introduction and Related Work sections. We also added a paragraph to the Related Work section.
- It looks like you have used an “n-gram language model”, but this is not clearly explained.
 - ✓ In the beginning of the Methodology section, we gave a brief introduction to the N-gram language model, and how it is implemented.
- Your results show that n-gram models are good, but based on previous work it looks like they must be combined with a form of supervised learning to be even more effective.
 - ✓ We changed the final paragraph in the Discussion section to “All that being said, our

method could still be used in combination with a form of supervised learning, in order to be more effective and achieve a decent accuracy rate.”.

- **Other Comments**

- ✓ All done.