

Peer Review For Group 2

Project 2. MATH 4995

Group Number: 2

Title: Pawpularity Prediction.

Summary of the report

The primary objective of the report is to create prediction model for the Kaggle Pawpularity Prediction problem. Images and dataset from the respective Kaggle contest is used. Data analysis, simple models on only tabular data and images, final models were used and selected. Models such as logistic regression, decision trees and CNN were used. Future research were stated to show possibilities of improvement.

Strengths of the report

The report is very comprehensive on each of the part and have demonstrated the pros and cons of models. Moreover, the data analysis shown have indicated issues and why certain models were selected. Sufficient and appropriate figures are used.

Weaknesses of the report

Very few weakness could be identified. However, if possible, variations of specific model could be tried out. For example, CNN of different layer design, decision tree with other parameters could be tried out.

Evaluation on quality of writing: 5

Is the report clearly written? Is there a good use of examples and figures? Is it well organized? Are there problems with style and grammar? Are there issues with typos, formatting, references, etc.? Please make suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper, and provide details of typos.

The writing is very clear and with sufficient information and sufficient explanations. They are well organized in terms of order and clarity. References have shown that the report have deep investigation and are with heavy preparation.

Evaluation on presentation: 5

Is the presentation clear and well organized? Are the language flow fluent and persuasive? Are the slides clear and well elaborated? Please make suggestions to improve the presentation.

The presentation is really engaging, with a very interesting introduction as a way to brought in the investigation. The data analysis shown is comprehensive. Different approaches are done to show thinking in different perspective. Future analysis were made to show possibilities of improvement.

Evaluation on creativity: 4

Does the work propose any genuinely new ideas? Is this a work that you are eager to read and cite? Does it contain some state-of-the-art results? As a reviewer you should try to assess whether the ideas are truly new and creative. Novel combinations, adaptations or extensions of existing ideas are also valuable.

Not only is the introduction of the presentation creative, the report give out many insights on different models. Different techniques are tried out and explored in this dataset.

Overall rating: 4.5

(5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2- below average. 1- a poorly written one).

Confidence on your assessment: 3

(3- I have carefully read the paper and checked the results, 2- I just browse the paper without checking the details, 1- My assessment can be wrong)

I have read through the report and presentation slides several times to ensure that my assessment is accurate enough.

