Group 6

• Summary of the report.

The report works on a classic problem in ML: Predicting survivors on Titanic. It briefly introduces the dataset and the way it is preprocessed. Logistics regression is selected as baseline model to perform the main approach: feature selection. The result aligned with what we have learn, also give some insight about important features. Overall, I feel that not so many things have been done on this project.

• Describe the strengths of the report.

It well replicates the work from Chapter 6 of ISLR, with full comparison between each method to choose model.

• Describe the weaknesses of the report.

The report is pretty simple, as only logistics regression is applied. "Data processing" part does not show the final set of features to perform backward/forward search. Tables and graphs are not well annotated (no legend in graphs, accuracy on test or train set??)

Also, the report needs to relate the importance of features to the real scenarios. Many articles did inform the disaster to us, such as https://www.history.com/topics/early-20th-century-us/titanic#section_8. It gives a precious information that "In compliance with the law of the sea, women and children boarded the boats first; only when there were no women or children nearby were men permitted to board." That really explained why women and children have higher chance to survive

• Evaluation on quality of writing (1-5): 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. 4

The visualization seems to account a lot of space, thus a bit little word to analyze the result. Overall, it clearly express the method.

• Evaluation on presentation (1-5): 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. 4

There is not much to say, as his presentation aligned well with the report. In term of language and presentation skill, I think it is okay.

• Evaluation on creativity (1-5): 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. 3

As I said before, work done on this report is the replication of some basic methods, not outstanding and remarkable.

• Confidence on your assessment (1-3) (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) 2