(1) In the last P2P meeting in London, Furong suggests comparing the Korean and Irish (or UK) data. Furong might have suggested another paper, but I think this gives excellent flavour in our paper. We have been in short of interesting figures and discussion. Could you compare the behaviour of two data sets and see whether we can the same empirical results, with the same code you used. I assume you still have to sort out the new data and plot the time series, but you could do this after sorting out the partial optimisation and while we all are writing the paper.
> Yes, I will do this. I have the Irish data. As soon as I have some results I will update you.

(2) You suggested a group of 50 customers is the optimal size when the aggregation is random. Would you be able to provide an example of the aggregated time series in comparison with individual time series? You could construct subplots in one figure. This gives the reviewers a clearer explanation of what we are doing and tells how smooth the time series becomes. You can pick a representative sample, not extreme.
> Actually this is one of the week points I think we should discuss. I am trying to move away from # of customers, and use demand aggregation levels in the text and figures.

(3) I don't see which forecast horizons you are mentioning in all the figures related to forecasting. Could you specify this? In addition, could you also show a figure for longer horizon we tried? Did we generated a figure for 24 hour ahead last time I asked?
> Yes, I have both 1h and 24h. Should we use both?

(4) In Figure 1, remove "4 weeks" in all the subplots and move it to the Figure 1 title / description.
> Done

(5) In Figure 2, why do you use deseasonalised demand rather than the original demand. Could you put the seasonality back on? Change KWh to kWh to everywhere in the paper to be consistent.
> I used deseasonalised because I am talking about it after explaining we deseasonalised the data. The original data may give room for questioning why we didn't plot deseasonalised, as we already mentioned we did this, am I wrong? If you think it is better, I can use the original data for this plot. I corrected kWh everywhere I found problems now.

(6) In Figure 3, change KDE (W=4) to KDE using 4 hours. Similar to 24 hours. The x-axis title should be "forecast horizons (h)".
> Done

(7) In Figures 4 and 5, the x-axis title needs to be changed to "Forecast Uncertainty in CRPS (kWh)". The y-title should be "Expected Demand (kWh)".
> I will do this as soon as we decide what figures we are using for this part of the paper.

(8) Add the results of partial optimisation instead of binary when it's ready.
> This was on my previous email. I attach it again.

(9) Figure 3 has up to 60 hours ahead. Why not covering up to 72 hours ahead as it covers three days fully and it must be sufficient for P2P?
> I used 60h because I though 48h would be enough, so 12 more hours wouldn't hurt. If you think we need 72h I'll can simulate again.