Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. This article is too long, so long that I once thought that such a long article should not be used as information for this written test. Throughout the full text, this article is actually using excessive generics, the same type, the same meaning has been said and said, and in the end, there is no valuable point of view. However, the Rashomon collection mentioned in the article is a very novel concept, and I have not found relevant information on the Internet. The article mentions the definition of Rashomon set "consider that the data permit a large set of reasonably accurate predictive models to exist. Because this set of accurate models is large, it often contains at least one model that is interpretable. This model is thus both interpretable and accurate."

My point of view is that Rashomon set is unrealistic and can’t be used to meaningfully capture explainable models. There are two angles. One is that the many assumptions in this definition lack rigor and are shoddy. The second is that human beings’ persistence and paranoia about the word ‘meaning’ will bring unnecessary arguments in myriads aspect

Looking closely at this definition, the Rashomon set is "the set of reasonably accurate predictive models (say within a given accuracy from the best model accuracy of boosted decision trees)". The definition of reasonably accurate here is vague. Later, he said that a large Rashomon set exists because for a limited good data set, there are many machine learning models with good accuracy, such as random forests, neural networks, support vector machines. In addition, we know that there are many machine learning models based on other algorithms and formulas