8. [10 points] The final task for the project is to evaluate a peer project. Similar to the second assignment, we need you to validate and comment on the reproducibility of the results of the group project assigned to you. The group-validator assignments has been posted on Piazza.

- Write a brief summary (1 paragraph) of the project assigned to you: What problem they target? Why is it important? Their approach? Their progress?

  At first their project target to make people who has little experience with computer science to use machine learning model easily. Then they have changed their target to autoscaling a text analyzing part for computationally intensive applications and in-memory key-value database. |This is important because that it can make people who knows nothing to text analysis to use text analysis in a convenient way. The autoscaling increases the speed for user to use this text analysis to deal with the high compacity of requests. |Their approach is as follow. At first, the client sends request by calling REST APIs in their systems. Then the nginx server get the request and analyse it. If the user requests is high, then they use Kubernetes and dockers to automatically scale the server side to handle the requests. Finally, they return the text analysis result of the request.| Their progress is very good. They have finished all they want to do and get an excellent project with awesome performance.

- Write a comment or question for that project.

  The autoscaling is good with a high demand, but what if the demand varies rapidly, this may cause a lot of waste. After a peak, the scale has been increased to maximum, and this may cause a lot waste since the rest demand is not that high. Is there an auto-shrinking method to deal with this problem? How can you use these method with appropriate controlling to reduce the waste.

- Please use the following rubric to leave a score on the reproducibility of their results. Note that this is not their nal grade. The teaching sta will be evaluating the projects and reproduce the results separately. This is just to give us another perspective and practice peer-validation.

  (a) Code ran to completion and results matched very well with the report.

- [Optional] Feel free to write some additional feedback in addition to the reproducibility score. We will also appreciate if you can comment on the quality of analysis and if you thought it was interesting.