**Group 1:**

• Summary of the report.

This is a nice report with a detailed theory introduction and data analysis before model building. They used LightGBM which is very suitable for grasping the data relationship between nonlinear input and output and can fit the value fluctuation.

• Describe the strengths of the report.

1. Detailed theory introduction
2. Rich visualization to analyze the dataset.
3. LightGBM outperforms other models in the public score.

• Describe the weaknesses of the report.

1. The private score is quite high, I’m not sure if it is due to the model itself or the Kaggle rules.

• Evaluation on Clarity and 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.

5

• Evaluation on Technical Quality (1-5): Are the results technically sound? Are there obvious

flaws in the reasoning? Are claims well-supported by theoretical analysis or experimental

results? Are the experiments well thought out and convincing? Will it be possible for other

researchers to replicate these results? Is the evaluation appropriate? Did the authors clearly

assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their approach? Are relevant papers cited,

discussed, and compared to the presented work?

5

• Overall rating: (5- My vote as the best-report. 4- A good report. 3- An average one. 2-

below average. 1- a poorly written one).

5

• 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)

3