

**Summary of the report:**

Mainly 5 parts in the report in one page. The report is very clean and compact but seems to lack content such as the reason to choose lightgbm. Add more details then it will become a good report.

**Describe the strengths of the report.**

Clean and compact with key information noted. Introduction and Feature Processing and Prediction and Analysis clarify what they are doing and why they are doing so.

**Describe the weaknesses of the report.**

Didn't say why they choose lightgbm and make it their final model. One can say anything if they choose the model that gets a high score, but it's not always convincing.

**Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5): 4**

The report is clearly written. There is some good use of examples and figures but they are not enough. It's well organized with few grammar and words problems. A typo like "this two types of feature indicate that".

**Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): 3.5**

Results are technically sound. But there exist some flaws in the reasoning and didn't try to explain why some features are important. Claims are well-supported by theoretical analysis and experimental results. The approach and result are convincing in the aspect of the integrity of the experiment and it can be reproduced by others. The authors didn't assess the strengths and weaknesses of their approach and compare with others. No reference was noted.

**Overall rating: 3.5****Confidence on your assessment (1-3) : 2.5**

I have carefully read the paper and but didn't check the original codes.