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**SUMMARY:** The authors have done a great job. Please find the detailed comments below.

**FOCUS:**

**Does the paper clearly identify the problem it is addressing?**

The authors have clearly outlined the problem it is trying to address with interesting statistics and references as supports. They have provided enough examples to make the readers thoroughly understand why this problem is important and difficult at the same time.

**Does the paper clearly explain related work and their limitations?**

Related work on the Modifiable Areal Unit Problem and Income inequality statistics are presented to outline what has been done so far. Furthermore, the limitations of existing works are also clearly outlined to highlight the shortcomings of the current existing approaches. To assist the reader, a visual presentation is also provided to demonstrate the limitations.

**Does the paper identify its key contributions?**

The paper identifies its key contributions right after the limitations of the existing research. This definitely helps the reader to gradually move from one section to another and improve readability.

**Does the paper present any evidence to support the contribution claim?**

This part is still in progress, however, authors have clearly outlined their proposed approach to tackle the problem.

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION:**

**Is the literature survey complete?**

The literature review seems a little bit inadequate. For example, more references may be needed in the introduction section.

**Is the work novel relative to the literature? Explain.**

The work is novel as the authors understand the knowledge gap in the field and are trying to combine two different areas of research in their work.

**As a reviewer do you agree with the contribution claims? Explain.**

The arguments together with the literature review make a strong case for the contribution claim.

**READABILITY AND ORGANIZATION:**

**Is the paper easy to read and understand to students in this course (Csci 8715)?**

The paper is neatly written and very easy to follow even by the students who are new to this topic.

**Is the paper self-contained?**

The paper is still under development, so, it is difficult to comment on this.

**Is the paper length reasonable?**

At this point, the paper length is reasonable.

**Does it include sufficient number of figures and tables?**

It is difficult to comment on this since the paper is still under development.

**STRENGTHS:**

**What are the strengths of this paper?**

* Clear identification of the problem
* Understanding of the status-quo
* The clarity in writing and flow of the paper
* Use of thorough dataset to draw an inference

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:**

**How can this paper be improved? If you were to rewrite this paper, what revisions would you consider?**

* Merge related work under the introduction section
* Some of the parts of the introduction are fragmented than necessary. For example, the first three paragraphs in the introduction can be merged.
* The order of references needs to be taken care of. For example, references 2 and 3 appear before 1 in the paper.
* References mentioned in the Fig.2 are missing in the references section.