

### **Summary of the report.**

Clear statement of dataset, method, result, analysis and conclusion

### **Describe the strengths of the report.**

Very clear and in detail. Self-analysis cons and pros and give a future improvement direction.

### **Describe the weaknesses of the report.**

No more models and feature engineering have been tried

**Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5): Is the report clearly written? Is there a good use of examples and figures? Is it well organized? Are there problems with style and grammar? Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.? Please make suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper and provide details of typos.**

5

**Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): Are the results technically sound? Are there obvious flaws in the reasoning? Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental results? Are the experiments well thought out and convincing? Will it be possible for other researchers to replicate these results? Is the evaluation appropriate? Did the authors clearly assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their approach? Are relevant papers cited, discussed, and compared to the presented work?**

4

**Overall rating: (5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2- below average. 1- a poorly written one).**

4

**Confidence on your assessment (1-3) (3- I have carefully read the paper and checked the results, 2- I just browse the paper without checking the details, 1- My assessment can be wrong)**

2