Peer review 2. Project: **Koopman Forecasting package**

1. The objectives of the project can be inferred from the report though formulated a bit vaguely. I would've added a short summary of what the team is going to do to the problem statement (i.e. what NN they're going to train, what framework they're going to use, and features of their project). Though this information is in the report it is scattered throughout it.
2. The baseline solution is relevant to the problem. As the method selected by the team is suitable for climate prediction then it is worth considering the dataset collected by the authors of "NOAA's Merged Land–Ocean Surface Temperature Analysis" in addition to the one suggested in the original paper
3. The evaluation protocol is not described by the team in the report, however, it is apparent that they're going to follow the one described in the original paper.
4. Based on section 4 of the reviewed report, it is possible to assume next steps of the research for team members, and it is reasonable to highlight that they can conduct the study independently and simultaneously, without waiting for the other member to complete his part. This indicates good resource allocation in the team.
   Further steps of the research imply refactoring two mentioned methods with chosen framework:
   a. refactoring the 1st method
   b. refactoring the 2nd method
   (both - with PyTorch Lighting)
   c. implementations with Ray
5. Overall, the quality of the report is good, except for the aforesaid comment about the necessity of adding the paragraph which describes the evaluation process in more detail. Without it, the report seems to be a little ambiguous and incomplete, although intuitively reasonable.
6. The project github repository is systematically organized, convenient and easy to follow.