5-9-23

rf-fs comparisons in R comments —
The R random forest doesn't do as poorly
as I recall, I suggest for 2 reasons:
1) train data more evenly dispersed
2) predict/eval on σ, μ and not
raw values; improves r2 over
a prediction of μ (which is what
comes out otherwise)

Still != and often worse than from
sklearn. This may relate to
either which or how much of the
dataset it was trained on. — this
R one has 50% of all data;
sklearn had 80%. This would be
testable if I used the saved train/
test using the pandas sample seed.

More widely, though:

It's nice that they quickly converge; was weird they didn't seem to.

rf will make it easier to export as an R package & integrate w/ metaRoLE, RoLE, etc.