



Paper	Muchlinski et al.	Colaresi and Mahmood	Wang	Kaufman et al.
Claim	Random Forests model drastically outperforms Logistic regression models	Random Forests models drastically outperform Logistic regression model	Adaboost and Gradient Boosted Trees (GBT) drastically outperform other models	Adaboost outperforms other models
Error	[L1.2] Pre-proc. on train-test (Incorrect imputation)	[L1.2] Pre-proc. on train-test (Incorrect reuse of an imputed dataset)	[L1.2] Pre-proc. on train-test. (Incorrect reuse of an imputed dataset) [L3.1] Temporal leakage (<i>k</i> -fold cross validation with temporal data)	[L2] Illegitimate features (Data leakage due to proxy variables) [L3.1] Temporal leakage (<i>k</i> -fold cross validation with temporal data)
Impact	Random Forests perform no better than Logistic Regression	Random Forests perform no better than Logistic Regression	Difference in AUC between Adaboost and Logistic Regression drops from 0.14 to 0.01	Adaboost no longer outperforms Logistic Regression. None of the models outperform a baseline model that predicts the outcome of the previous year
Discussion	Impact of the incorrect imputation is severe since 95% of the out-of-sample dataset is missing and is filled in using the incorrect imputation method	Re-use the dataset provided by Muchlinski et al., which uses an incorrect imputation method	Re-use the dataset provided by Muchlinski et al., which uses an incorrect imputation method	Use several proxy variables for the outcome as predictors (e.g., <i>colwars</i> , <i>cownwars</i> , <i>sdwars</i> , all proxies for civil war), leading to near perfect accuracy