Reviews I gave to others:

```
Michael Ward's Review of Allison Chan's report
----------------------------------------------

1. I would recommending providing some sort of intro. Just getting dropped into the report with the images first
thing is a little disorienting, and the fact that I only have a vague idea of what your project is about
starting on page 4. So I would definitely include an introduction / outline of what the report is about - e.g.
What the model is.

2. Along with step 1, I would recommend providing a bit more explanation about some of the pictures at the top.

3. I really like how you went over each individual input in-depth and explained why you did/didn't keep them in
your model.


Michael Ward's Review of Andrea Smith's report
----------------------------------------------

1. Well done! I really like your project, especially how everything is laid out and nicely shown. Plenty of graphs and
tables. :)

2. I would recommend putting in some sort of abstract or introduction instead of just throwing the reader into the
report.
```

Reviews I received:

Smith, Andrea UMSL-Student <aes7dc@mst.edu>   9:53 PM (1 hour ago)   ☆
to Michael ▾

- nice formatting
- did you determine that the commander eligibility didn't matter through testing or by eye-balling the data? [part 1]
- you talked about evolution of the model, but there didn't seem to much direction comparison of linear/logistic or linear/sigmoid [part 2]
- did you do part 5, code your own function with the weights from the trained model?