*“Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead”*. This article is so long that I once thought that such a long article should not be used as the reading material for this written test. Throughout the full text, this article is actually using excessive generics, the same type, the same meaning has been discussed over and over again, and there is no valuable point of view in the conclusion. However, the Rashomon collection mentioned in the article is a novel concept which I have not found relevant information on the Internet. The article introduce 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 based on the reason that many assumptions in this definition is lack of delicateness and are shoddy.

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 limited good data set, there are many machine learning models with good accuracy, such as random forests, neural networks, support vector machines. What’s important is that we know there are still exist additional machine learning models based on other algorithms and formulas which may perform good accuracy but the amount of those good model are factually countable. Based on the fact mentioned above, the original text ”As long as the Rashomon set contains a large enough set of models with diverse predictions, it probably contains functions that can be approximated well by simpler functions” fail to construct a fundamental assumption by showing no factual evidence. More seriously, he used the word "possible" when he used logic to summarize the rationality of the existence of the Rashomon set. This error is fatal, since the author of this article write more than 9,000 words to explain to the world that a machine learning model with high accuracy (or probability) does not have the interpretability which he thinks is somewhat highly necessary, however, when he explained the rationality of the existence of the interpretable model, he actually used the word "problably" as the crucial part of the logic. When he criticized the black box machine model, he emphasized the importance of interpretability, but selectively ignored this standard when proving his own argument

In summary, the Rashomon collection is a novel concept, but at the same time it lacks the rigor of definition. It is more like an abstract tool that created by some arguers to prove their unrealistic views.