

Peer Review №3: OMS on Cohortney

Nikolay Kozyrskiy, Gleb Balitskiy

May 2021

1. **Reproducibility of results.** We have run the tests presented by the team. They worked properly, and moreover we want to point out that configuration files are well-structured and easy to use.
2. **Results Description.** The results are presented for two considered methods out of six which were proposed in the beginning. But as authors mentioned the problem was that implementations of these methods in initial repos didn't work properly. And, moreover, the main goal of the project was to propose convenient API for clustering algorithms. So lack of methods is not a problem in our opinion. For two working method the results are presented for many datasets. After looking at the obtained numbers, we can conclude that they are correct and there are no mistakes there. Still it would better if the team presented validation results in one table, because it was a little time consuming to check them.
3. **Real-world use cases.** The project structure and API is some kind of comfortable. We think that this framework has the right to live, but authors still need to continue working on it and add more algorithms. Still even now, the framework can be used to solve clustering problems in industry applications like websites use clustering, or bank transactions clustering and other.