General:

* Reads more like an email than a paper; not very cohesive
  + Don’t use bulleted lists, use tables
  + Don’t break it up into as many sections; let it flow better
  + We should probably spend more time reading the report from start to finish before submitting it (to make sure it flows and that the key idea is communicated)
* Equation format is hard to read
* “Terse in the explanation”
* In general, make sure you explain concepts (from the literature) that you rely on
  + FIO write up is vague
    - What is the “constraint” you’re referring to?
    - Make sure you explain underlying con

Results:

* Make sure you include the model where you only use Q (this one should obviously be totally fair)

**For final:**

* At minimum, compare counterfactual fairness on the synthetic dataset
* At best, apply your most fair technique to a real-world dataset
  + Probably German credit? We can apply path-specific fairness to this