**Peer review sheet**

MAFS6010Z, 2021 fall

Your name and sid: XIA Yiqiao 20747238

Group that you review: 8

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Confidence on your assessment (1-3) | Clarity and quality of writing (1-5) | Technical quality  (1-5) | Overall rating  (1-5) |
| Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

Summary:

Generally speaking, this group successfully replicated the majority of the paper and provided possible reasons for the pattern conflict.

Strengths:

1. All models are well tested.

Weaknesses:

1. Too many grammar errors were spotted. A review process is suggested.
2. Codes are not friendly to readers.
3. Some codes can be reused, and could be wrote more neatly.

Clarity and writing:

1. Some grammar errors were spotted. E.g. it should be “within this range” instead of “in this range”. “the result is as shown below” is more frequently used. The plural sense should be used in “different model”. “variables” should “perform” rather than “performs”. It should be "with increased number of layers” rather than "with increase number of layers”.
2. No references. Understood that it’s a replication process, but I do think it is necessary to add references by the end of the report.

Technical quality:

1. Codes are not friendly to readers.
   1. No comments were observed.
   2. Results of all models were presented within one cell, including model evaluation indicators like R2 and SIC. Individual display of the best model is suggested.
   3. Codes for out-of-sample data were not found
2. Some codes can be reused, and could be wrote more neatly.
3. It is suggested to use more model performance assessment indicators. R2 could be misleading sometimes.