Things we agree on:
Paper is readable for non-experts

Paper generally does a good job at presenting the research problem, describing results and providing evidence
  Results might be tangential, because this is just looking at the regular AutoTutor vs Emotive Autotutor

Current tutor looks unnatural

Hardware is unfeasible in most settings (or nothing proves otherwise)

Things we disagree on:
Whether a dialogue-based tutor is extremely useful for learning subjects like physics and computer science

Whether the purpose is to replace real people

Questions/Suggestions:
Is emotive modelling generally useful?

What are the contexts when students would go to a tutor?
  ...Only when they need help?
  ...To study from the start?

With comments on affective state by tutor, is student able to correct assessment of affective state if wrong?
  Suggestion: Explicitly ask -- or have an option ('I'm bored' or 'I don't get it!'), this way is maybe a bit too roundabout? Or would benefit more from explicit affective states
  Student's own perception seems to be considered erroneous when it differs from judges' -- may be a bit of a philosophical question, but people may look different when they experience the same emotions

Maybe see how adjusting how the tutor avatar looks?

Is difference in learning gains between first and second session due to
  ...familiarity?
  ...a better model?