Opponent’s name: <Daniel Ciovica AND Piriya Sureshkumar>

Opposition for group: <Group 1. Predictive Analysis of Length...>

Keep in mind that your feedback is essential to each of these other groups, as your feedback will enable them to improve their report and guide them as to issues to raise in their oral presentation. Providing and receiving feedback is an essential part of your participation in the course.

1. Critique the organization, structure, and layout of the report

**Organization follows the guidelines for all sections. We are just missing a section on *Future Implementations* and a clearer and more detailed explanation of the *hypothesis*.**

1. Critique the abstract

**The reader can get the overall picture of the topic that they are going to address. They do mention how to tackle the problem , although they do not clearly explain what the problem exactly is. Overall, it is a very complete abstract.**

1. Critique the literature study

They might include more references to justify **all their statements.**

**They also do not mention why they are choosing those studies for comparison to their own. There might be a problem with commensurability since there might might be issues when comparing their projects to their own.**

**They might also want to include a justification of why they are following the procedure they mention on their report.**

1. Critique the method (or methods) used

**It is very complete. They state which method they are going to use at each point, and why. Maybe we are missing a little bit more references here, too. They might also want to justify why they chose that data-set.**

1. Critique the results and analysis

We believe some parts (such as the programming language and libraries they use) can actually be included in the *Methodology* section.

They also went in detail, so that others can reproduce they work step by step.

They might also want to further expand the *Data Exploration* section for the final report -albeit it is **a remarkable job** for a draft, so far.

1. Critique the discussion

**As the hypothesis is not clearly stated at the beginning, it is difficult to understand if it was supported or not.**

**They also mention classification for the first time, so it is quite confusing for the reader.**

**They also mention about readmitted patients and appear multiple times, so we believe they should have done *duplicate removal* from the very beggining.**

1. Critique the conclusions: Are they relevant, meaningful, and follow from the discussion? Who should act based upon these conclusions, and what should they do?

**They did not mention the classification problem in detail before, such as in the *Methodology* and *Results* section.**

**Everything else, we believe is a great work. They can use these results for other medical-based studies.**

1. Critique the planned future work (if any)

**The future work needs still be implemented. There was just one line at the end of the *Conclusion* section.**

1. Are the references appropriate, complete, and used correctly? Are there any missing references?

**Bibliography format is correct, yet more should definitely be added for the final delivery.**

1. Now is the time to identify *anything* false, incorrect, misleading, or unclear. What issues did you find?

**Hypothesis is not initially stated in detail, as neither is the classification problem, which can be misleading afterwards.**

**Finally, it would also be fine to add more references, and justifications throughout the report.**

# Appendix

**The overall appearance is very good, as is the integration of pictures and tables. They should continue in this way for the final report, maybe adding some more graphs (perhaps in the appendix) for further clarification.**

Directions: When you upload your opposition report into Canvas, as your review, the filename of your opposition report should be of the form:

opponent’s\_name-Opposition-for-group\_number-YYYYMMDD

With the date in the filename is the data that you submit this written opposition.