**You will peer evaluate two of your classmates (whose last names directly follow yours).**

Based on the following 7 evaluation metrics, write a reviewer’s report of comments with no more than 200 words in total for each student. Please give a score for each evaluation metric, and add up your total score for each report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Abstract: | 5% | Provide context, motivation, and summary of findings. What questions are being answered? Why are these questions interesting/important? |
| Data: | 5% | Variables descriptions? What cleanups were done to the data? Good Graphics and Visualizations? |
| Models: | 5% | What did you do? What models and techniques did you use? Was any innovation attempted? |
| Results: | 5% | Did you properly evaluate your models performance? What are your conclusions? |
| Code: | 5% | Well documented Python codes with reproducible outputs? Good programming? |
| Quality: | 5% | Clarity of writing/presenting? Good readability of Notebook? |
| Complexity: | 5% | Complexity of your entire data collection, preprocessing, modeling, and analyses process in terms of data size and models sophistications. |

Your name: Amanda Culley

The student’s name you are reviewing: Ensheng Dong

The title of the project you are reviewing: Capital Bikeshare Prediction

Your scores and comments for each evaluation metric and the total:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Abstract** | **Data** | **Models** | **Results** | **Code** | **Quality** | **Complexity** | **TOTAL** |
| 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 35% |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 33 |
| Good level of detail and context provided. | Good variable description. Excellent data visualization! Separated datetime variable into 3 columns: month, day, hour. Made a binary column for counts >1 | Good range of models selected, but since the response variable was continuous, better to use regression, not classification for knn, decision tree, bagged, random forest and, boosted | The RMSE and RMSLE were both good, accuracy score doesn’t work very well with a continuous response variable. Excellent evaluation summary section. | Good programming. I liked the section where you defined your scoring, it was pretty interesting. | Clear and readable. | Good compexity, there was data preprocessing, feature selection, and you tried boosted tree models, which we didn’t do in homework. |  |