5:

* Summary of the report.
  + They did M5 forecasting. They compared both the accuracy and computing time of three models, including SES, LSTM and LGBM and chose SES finally.
* Describe the strengths of the report.
  + 1. They clearly explained how they chose the parameter.
  + 2. The compared three models’ performance and computing time.
* Describe the weaknesses of the report.
  + 1. Suggestion: add an EDA or pre-processing part.
* 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
  + Poster is well written with clear graphical illustration.
* 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?
  + 4
  + Maybe more details about the preprocessing part would be better.
* 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