CSC5610: Final Project
PEER FEEDBACK FORM

Date: <u>12.12.2023</u>   Evaluator:Tyler Graham, Jessie Bernitt, Kiran Mocha

Group Members: Andrew Glassman, Eric Dethloff, Kaden Young
Presentation Title: Predicting Amazon Reviews

	Feedback
Problem Description and Background Information The problem or question that the group is exploring is described in a clear manner. The group members have adequately presented their peers with the pertinent background information to understand the problem.	Project description was very clear and had additional slide outlining the stakeholders.
Feature Engineering The group engineered new features from the original and complementary data and evaluated the impact of the new features on model prediction performance.	Lots of features were added in from the dataset with a lot of processing. Really cool technology, I have a lot to google up after watching the presentation to better understand it since I am not familiar with NLP.
Incorporation of Additional Data Sets The group identified at least 2 complementary data sets, joined the data sets with the original data set, and evaluated the impact of the new features on model prediction performance.	Is the Lemmatization & BBOW considered an addition dataset or a feature? If yes, then I saw 3 datasets. The last one did not have evaluations on it, but the other two did.
Exploration of Different Model Types The group explored alternative model types and evaluated the impact of the new features on model prediction performance.	Lots of fascinating models were used with tons of different techniques and optimizations!

Overall Analysis Efforts The group used an appropriate experimental design and metrics. Results were interpreted correctly.	Overall, really good use of the confusion matrix graphs really helped show what you were talking about and how you created a subset of your initial data.
Minimal, Explainable Model A feature selection approach was applied to identify a minimal set of features that give similar performance to the full model. The features used in the minimal model are explained and interpreted.	In hindsight, was this the final trained model or would it have been the model after you used the lemmatization? (I may have just forgot…) Maybe this could be called out a bit more clearly to ensure you get the points?
Presentation of Results and Discussion Results were clearly articulated. The significance of the results were discussed and placed in context. This includes the proper explanation of graphs, figures, and tables. The discussion summarizes what was learned about the original question / problem from the selected features and the utility of the feature engineering, complementary data sets, and alternative models.	Very well presented.
Effective Use of Visuals Presentation included visual aids and used them effectively.	Yes.
Delivery Style Presentation was well-rehearsed, no reading from notes or slides. The volume, rate, confidence, eye-contact, lack of filler words, and time frame was appropriate and effective.	Yes. It was clear they had a deep understanding of what they did and the models used and how it improved as they went.

Additional Comments: Well Done! Was really cool to learn about NLP and hear about the models you used and the process of improvement. Only complaint was the presentation was not longer so I could learn more on how those models work!