Name: Mohammadreza Attar Seyedi

Riccardo Rossi:

Quality of English: A
    The text is well written.

Quality of Text (Layout and content): B
    Layout is ok. You use only very few figures but this is justified by the subject. Unfortunately you completely miss the bibliography, which is an essential part of a scientific report. This justifies downgrading your work to a B, while it could have easily achieved an A if you took care of the bibliography. Note that if the work was sent to a journal it would be immediately rejected for the very same reason.

Rafael Pacheco:

Quality of English: A
    The lexicon and vocabulary used is the correct one. Minor typos on the tittles (capital letter such as: "2.2 preconditioning " ; "4 conclusion")

Quality of Text (Layout and content): B+
    The layout is not bad, it can be seen that a latex template has been used.

A few personal remarks – note that this is an opinion and any paper layout has to meet the requirements of the publisher. If yours were met, then the following two remarks do not apply – when using a standard template you may want to change a little bit the margin sizes in latex, or at least to add some extra logos or watermarks to fill the gap that these blank spaces leave onto the paper area. This typically can be done altering the ".cls" file of the template you are using:

Secondly, I would suggest on changing the line spacing, and paragraph spacing. Since for some readers, it is quite difficult to follow the thread without any visual break between them. Also it is important to delimitate the paragraphs, because using a justified text without a visual difference between paragraphs makes the visual appearance quite messy.

In latex this can be easily done by:
Distance between paragraphs: "\setlength{\parskip}{9pt}"
Distance between lines: "\setlength{\baselineskip}{15pt}"

Third, - and optionally - maybe using a better quality images and a little bit bigger would be an improvement (however, it is not excessively small or blurry, since at the end, you are showing the sparsity and it is quite understandable as you presented your work).

Fourth, I agree that maybe some previous works you based your work on would be needed, and therefore some references or bibliography section.