

Peer Review

1. Summary of the report:

The report is divided into five parts, from data processing to feature engineering, to LightGBM modeling, and some model validation. The report is very clean and but seems to lack content such as the creation of some new features, comparison of different index. Add more details then it will become a good report. And finally scored 0.69 in Kaggle.

2. The strengths of the report.

Clean and compact with key information noted. Introduction and Data Processing and Feature engineering and Performance Evaluation clarify what they are doing and why they are doing so.

3.The weaknesses of the report.

Didn't say how they set the ratio, 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 convinible. The page lack content such as the creation of some new features, comparison of different index. Add more details then it will become a good report. And finally scored 0.69 in Kaggle.

4. Evaluation on Clarity and quality of writing (1-5): 3

The report is clearly written. There is some good graphs and figures but they are not enough. It's well organized with few grammar and words problems.

Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): 3.5

Results are technically sound. But there exist some comparisons between different indexes. And the data preprocessing is relatively insufficient. The approach and result are convincing in the aspect of the integrity of the experiment and it can be reproduced by others. The references are attached.

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