

Checklist for reporting and evaluating machine learning models	
1. Data sources	
<i>1a. Are all data sources listed and publicly available?</i>	
<i>1b. If using an external database, is an access date or version number provided?</i>	
<i>1c. Are any potential biases in the source dataset reported and/or mitigated?</i>	
2. Data cleaning	
<i>2a. Are the data cleaning steps clearly and fully described, either in text or as a code pipeline?</i>	
<i>2b. Is an evaluation of the amount of removed source data presented?</i>	
<i>2c. Are instances of combining data from multiple sources clearly identified, and potential issues mitigated?</i>	
3. Data representations	
<i>3a. Are methods for representing data as features or descriptors clearly articulated, ideally with software implementations?</i>	
<i>3b. Are comparisons against standard feature sets provided?</i>	
4. Model choice	
<i>4a. Is a software implementation of the model provided such that it can be trained and tested with new data?</i>	
<i>4b. Are baseline comparisons to simple/trivial models (for example, 1-nearest neighbour, random forest, most frequent class) provided?</i>	
<i>4c. Are baseline comparisons to current state-of-the-art provided?</i>	
5. Model training and validation	
<i>5a. Does the model clearly split data into different sets for training (model selection), validation (hyperparameter optimization), and testing (final evaluation)?</i>	
<i>5b. Is the method of data split (data splitting (for example, random, cluster- or time-based splitting, forward cross-validation) clearly stated? Does it mimic anticipated real-world application?</i>	
<i>5c. Does the data splitting procedure avoid data leakage (for example, is the same composition present in the training and test sets)?</i>	
6. Code and reproducibility	
<i>6a. Is the code or workflow available in a public repository?</i>	
<i>6b. Are scripts to reproduce the findings in the paper provided?</i>	